THE LIBERATOR

IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
NO. 11, MERCHANTS' HALL, BY
GARRISON AND KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

TERMS.

Two Dollars per annum, always payable IN ADVANCE.

All letters and communications must be post paid. The rule is imperative; in order to shield us from the frequent depredations of our enemies—the Postmasters, who wish their letters to be taken free of the Post Office by us, will be careful to pay their postage.

An advertisement making one square, or a less space of equal length and breadth, will be inserted one week for $1. One less than a square, 75 cts.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

[From the Bunker Hill Aurora.]

SOUTHERN DISCONTENT.

It is generally known that fears have been entertained by managers of our Southern fellow citizens that the Abolitionists, amalgamation, Tappan-men, or by whatever other name they may be called, would be able to make so many converts in the Northern States as to put in jeopardy our only certain pledge of liberty and independence, this guarantee of their rights, namely, the Union, viz. the *National Union*. It is possible, that the apprehension expressed in many able Southern journals may have fostered a false confidence in the amalgamating incendiaries, [who would otherwise have felt their insignificance,] and induced them to believe themselves strong enough to hoist, as they did in New-York both in the pulpit and double circles, the *standard of social and political equality*. It is not to be denied that the expression of any thing like dread from the side men of the South was exceedingly flattering to the vanity of the *conspirators*. *Their limited understandings and yet more limited pride* swelled with the consciousness of consequence. If you give a coward cause to suspect that you fear him, he becomes a hero—say, he *out-heroes heroism*. Thus was it with the Tappans, honest, honest, moneyraising fellows, and their *Reverend* coadjutors the Cokes, the Wockses, the—but class-ic Harvard is too nigh, and, in ordinary charity, I forbear. They precipitated the ministers, the assembled whites and negros promiscuously *at their domestic parties*, not secretly but vauntingly—they insisted upon the admixture in the pews of churches—they claimed, contrary to the penal laws, to marry, if not all, of the non-slaveholding *states, the right of intermarriage—they proclaimed the Lord Jesus Christ to have been a black man*.

Considering the intellectual condition of the blacks, and their situation as it respects property, it is clear that these wealthy, vain, glorious philanthropists, had no idea themselves of intermarrying with negroes; nor did they desire or expect that any one of their caste or class would select for his helpmate a dingy beauty. The obvious consequence of establishing the propriety of intermarriage between the two distinct races, the white and the black, would be to subject the poorer classes, the laborers, seamen, a large portion of the mechanics, farmers, professional men, and others, who live as they can, to the danger of this degradation. This is dangerous, because the poorer class constitute the great mass of society; and, if we are to become a mongrel race, the wealthy men, who propose it, have unquestionably, too much taste to intend that the experiment shall begin with themselves. If their taste led that way, they would have taken black wives and kept quiet. No one would have molested them, nor made them afraid. And, if the *Lyceum*, the *Reverend* and *Learned* gentlemen, foreigners, and, not six miles from here, who have indicated some disposition, by the formation of a society, to follow the Tappans, will gratify their taste by marriage, I trust, if not now, at least without fear of the Grand Jury of Middlesex.

Mobbism is worse than absolute monarchy. Rather than be governed by mobs, give us, instead, the harshest and most despotic despotism that ever bestrode the earth. Give us Alexander when he was a madman—give us Napoleon when he was a black. Yet in a city like New-York, it is hardly not strange that the poorer people when these *wealthy philanthropists wished to move into intermarriage with negroes*, ignorant of the laws and not reposing sufficient confidence in their efficacy, should have gathered together to express their abhorrence of such *unnatural and unholy* practices and doctrines which encouraged persons of their class to contemn the rules of social life.

I commenced this article with the intention of observing that many respectable Southern journals, which they deprecate and lament the prevalence of *Mobbism*, are yet satisfied, by the riots in New-York, Philadelphia, and their vicinities, that the Southern States have nothing to apprehend from the *criminal intriguers and associations of the abolitionists*. They perceive a virtuous and honorable indignation throughout the whole North against the *small and miserable gang of incendiaries*; unanimous, as ALL the public press, while condemning the unlawful violence of the rioters, *have denounced the Tappan men as the foment ers, provokers, and creators of the riots. They have laid the guilt at their door*: and, in speaking the sentiments of the North without any party distinctions, they have told the South to leave the *Aegis* to us, and we will take care of them.

This has satisfied many of the journals of the South, and, perhaps, a vast majority of our Southern fellow citizens. Not so, with the celebrated *General Duff Green*. Situated at Washington City, midway between the slaveholding and non-slaveholding States, this industrious and really talented person sees scatters his firebrands east and west, north and south, as he imagines he may subserve the interests of that 'god of his idolatry,' the Southern Union.

In a late paper, this chief Apostle of the Nullifiers says, 'the attention of the north has been awakened, and that the incendiaries' (meaning the Tappan gang) 'say, is all they want to ensure success. They also see the Southern Union Jackson press playing into their hands so cleverly, by endeavoring to make the South believe, that the mobs of New-York have settled the question of emancipation, and nothing more need be said or done upon the subject. Those who can be taken in upon such flimsy grounds, are predestined fools, or they are knaves acting the part of secret friends to the incendiaries.'

How can we please Gen. Green? *If there had been no mobs*—if, on the contrary, the indecent doctrines of the *incendiaries* had been countenanced by the Northern people, there would have gotten language sufficiently stinging to express his rage, when he thus rebukes their discountenance of those doctrines? The universal sentiment at the North is, and Mr. Green knows it, adverse to the movements and tenets of Tappan and *his incendiaries*. He knows it, as well as he knows that he is printer to the Senate. But he makes every thing bend,—even his own reputation as a high minded and intellectual man he makes bend, to the *ulterior views*, which perhaps, *even he is not permitted yet to understand*, of his self-chosen master, John Caldwell Calhoun.

A PLAIN THINKER.

Turning and Feathering in Pennsylvania.—The following are extracts from the Lancaster Journal:

'In our quiet village of New Holland, we understand *Lynch's law* was carried into execution last week, against a stranger, who had given some offence to the inhabitants. The man was taken from his domicile, tarred and feathered in the true Yankee style, marched out of town and let run. We have not heard the cause of this summary proceeding.'

'We have heard of another case of an appeal to Lynch's code. A celebrated Philadelphia Doctor, a disciple of the Tappan school, who could not find room for the overflowings of his milk of human kindness in the city of brotherly love, paid a visit to Columbia, in this county, a few days since, prepared, it is said, to deliver a course of amalgamation lectures. A barrel of tar was purchased, and a pillow well stuffed with feathers procured for the occasion. A hint of these proceedings was given to the learned Doctor's friends, who did not keep the secret, and the Doctor not wishing to be exhibited in the costume of a goose, took wing in an eastern direction, and has not been heard of since.'

We observe a town meeting called, for Friday evening, to express public sentiment in relation to the late riots in Southwark! We hope no sentiments will be expressed, or were expressed, calculated to increase the insolence of the negroes; or having a bearing upon the question of immediate emancipation!! We think this meeting improper and ill-timed; and more calculated to do mischief than good. If this question is introduced into our politics, it will produce no benefit to the *whig* cause; and we do sincerely hope that those concerned in it have acted with prudence and discretion. If it be a perilous question; and such, we fear, it may prove, it may rest upon those who touch it but in the most profound spirit of wisdom and moderation. It may conciliate the Quakers; but it will inflame another description of our population; not so easy to be controlled.—*Phil. National Banner.*

BOSTON:

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1834.

'Report of the Arguments of Counsel, in the case of Prudence Crandall, Plaintiff in Error, vs. the State of Connecticut, before the Supreme Court of Errors, at their Session at Brooklyn, July Term, 1834. By a Member of the Bar.'

The legislature of the State of Connecticut, at its session in May, 1833, passed a law in the following words:

'Sec. 1. *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened,*—That no person shall set up or establish in this State any school, academy or literary institution for the instruction or education of colored persons, who are not inhabitants of this State, nor instruct or teach in any school, academy, or other literary institution whatsoever in this State, or harbor or board for the purpose of attending or being taught or instructed in any such school, academy or literary institution, any colored person who is not an inhabitant of any town in this State, without the consent in writing first obtained of a majority of the civil authority, and also of the Selectmen of the town in which such school, academy or literary institution is situated; and each and every person who shall knowingly do any act forbidden as aforesaid, or shall be aiding or assisting therein, shall, for the first offence, forfeit and pay to the treasurer of this State a fine of one hundred dollars, and for the second offence shall forfeit and pay a fine of two hundred dollars, and so double for every offence of which he or she shall be convicted; and all informing officers are required to make due presentment of all breaches of this act.

'Provided that nothing in this act shall extend to any district school established in any school society under the laws of this State, or to any school established by any school society under the laws of this State, or to any incorporated academy or incorporated school for instruction in this State.

'Sec. 2. *Be it further enacted*—That any colored person not an inhabitant of this State, who shall reside in any town therein for the purpose of being instructed as aforesaid, may be removed in the manner prescribed in the sixth and seventh sections of the act to which this is an addition.'

Under this statute, Miss Crandall was prosecuted, in the Superior Court of Connecticut, in the county of Windham, October, 1833, for 'harboring and boarding, certain persons of color, who were born in Pennsylvania, New-York, and Rhode-Island, and had come into Connecticut to attend the school of Miss Crandall, where they were taught the common and elementary branches of knowledge.' The jury found a verdict of guilty, and by Writ of Error the question of the constitutionality of the law came before the Supreme Court of Errors of Connecticut, in July, 1834, at Brooklyn.

STATE OF CONNECTICUT, Windham County, ss. Brooklyn, Supreme Court of Errors, July Term, A. D. 1834.

Present: HON. DAVID DAGGETT, *Chief Justice.*
HON. THOMAS S. WILLIAMS, } *Associate Judges.*
HON. CLARE BISSELL, }
HON. SAMUEL CHURCH, }

PRUDENCE CRANDALL, plaintiff in Error, vs. STATE OF CONNECTICUT. Counsel for Miss Crandall, Hon. CALVIN GODDARD, and Hon. WILLIAM W. ELLSWORTH; for the State, ANDREW T. JUDSON, Esq., and CHAUNCEY F. CLEVELAND, Esq.

Argument of WM. W. ELLSWORTH, in the case of the State of Connecticut vs. PRUDENCE CRANDALL. Delivered before the Supreme Court of Errors of the State of Connecticut, July, 1834.

May it please the Court:—The statute on which this prosecution is founded, prohibits the *setting* up a school for persons of color, without inhabitants of this state—teaching them in *any* school, or boarding and harboring them, to attend a school, without first obtaining the consent, in writing, of the civil authority and selectmen of the town where such school is situated.

The record finds, that the pupils in this case were born in the states of Pennsylvania, New-York, and Rhode Island respectively, of free parents, and have recently come into Connecticut, to attend Miss Crandall's school, where they are taught the common and essential branches of knowledge.

The principle asserted in this law, and indeed such is its very language, is, that it is a crime for any individual to entertain a person of color, not having a legal settlement in any town in this state, (though he was born and has ever lived in these states,) having come here to pursue the acquisition of learning, in a manner *open, common, and lawful to all our* population, white or *colored*. The condition imposed by the law will be found not to alter the character of the law, as I have now asserted it to be. A power to license, implies a power to refuse—what one holds by *permission*, he does not hold by *right*. And if the Legislature can delegate the power to license, it can exercise it itself; and hence, may impose conditions tantamount to exclusion or total denial. This statute, stripped of its appendages, makes the *place of birth* the criterion of the rights of citizens of these states; it is not a question of color, so much as of state *supremacy*; if a state may exclude a colored citizen of another state, it may exclude a white citizen.'

The defence of Miss Crandall will be rested upon the unconstitutionality of this statute law of Connecticut, and may be embraced under these two heads.

1. These pupils are *citizens* of their respective states.

2. As *citizens*, the constitution of the United States secures to them the right of *residing* in Connecticut, and pursuing the acquisition of knowledge, as people of color may do, who are settled here.

I would first remark, that if the constitution of the United States does indeed secure to these pupils this most valued right, it must secure the *means* necessary to enjoy the right: if the *pupils* may reside here—be entertained, and taught; it cannot be a crime to come to entertain or teach them. It is familiar law, that the specified powers in the constitution of the United States, contain a grant of all the powers necessary for their execution. A right that can be defeated at pleasure, is no right at all. The constitution of the United States secures to every man a right of trial by jury; but can the state legislature defeat this object, by making it criminal for a person to act on the jury in the courts of the United States? The aid and co-operation of a teacher is a constituent part of the right secured to these people of color.

Again, if color, in a citizen of New-York, is made the ground, in Connecticut, of political inequality, degradation and deprivation; the principle run out, will justify, at the *pleasure* of our Assembly, a like deprivation among our blacks. If not citizens and protected as such, they are *aliens*—their property may be confiscated, and they be driven out from our borders as Turks or Chinese.

To the first position then.

Are these pupils citizens of their state respectively?

If they were white, it is conceded they would be.

1. A distinction founded in *color*, in fundamental rights, is *novel, inconvenient* and *impracticable*. Hitherto we have seen no such distinction; none in the ancient common law of England which justly boasts of her equal principles; none in that immortal instrument which our republican fathers put forth as the ground-work of all just government—the Declaration of our Independence. There, we read, 'we hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created *equal*, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain *unalienable* rights, that among these are life, *liberty*, and the pursuit of happiness.' The constitution of Connecticut too, which this honorable Court, let me now add, have sworn they will defend; declares '*all* men when they enter into the social compact are equal in rights, and that no man or set of men are entitled to exclusive public emoluments or *privileges* from the community.' Whatever difficulties may embarrass courts of justice and halls of legislation where slavery prevails, let us not be ashamed of these great land-marks of free government as they are. I trust this distinction of color will not receive a judicial sanction, in Connecticut. The sentiments of this law may comport with notions entertained elsewhere, but they are abhorrent to the feelings of freemen and republicans, and they cannot receive countenance in this community.

2. Such were not the ideas of our fathers, when the colored soldier stood in the ranks of that army which achieved for us our liberty; nor when their names were enrolled on the pension list, as the records show, the testimonial, that *they* had a country and had bled for it.

A declaration like that just now read from the constitution of this state, in the state of Massachusetts, where it is to be found in the constitution, *exterminated* at a blow every vestige of slavery, by the decision of her courts. The distinction of color would be found as *inconvenient* as it is novel. Who can tell the proportion of mixture in colors of blood? We shall want a scale for the ascertainment of citizenship. In Virginia, in the year 1785, they defined, by law, a mulatto to be a person having at least, *one quarter* negro blood in him. The least taint of it here will exclude from the rank of citizens.

3. These pupils are human beings, born in these states, and owe the *same obligation* to the state and the state's governments, as white citizens.

There is in all the writers of public or municipal law, one ancient and universal classification of the people of a country. Blackstone, Kent, Swift, Dane, Tucker and all others, without exception, Vattel, Martin, Ward, &c., agree in this proposition, 'that all who are born within the jurisdiction of a state are natives, and all others are aliens.' There is not to be found the least trace of any other distinction; no allusion to any as existing in fact, none in principle. It may be true that these writers had not their attention called to the distinction of color, but then, they declare the settled law on this subject, and the reasons of the law; and color no more than stature or age bears a relation to it. The distinction is not alluded to, because it did not exist; nor can it exist, in the nature of things.

The classification grows out of the doctrine of natural allegiance, a tie vacated by *birth*, giving rise to rights and duties between the government and the citizens of the greatest importance and most permanent duration. All writers agree in the foundation of allegiance, and in its obligations, while it exists; some holding that it can never be thrown off, and some, that it can, under legislative enactments; but all agreeing that while the residence of the citizen continues, in the state of his birth, allegiance demands obedience from the citizen, and protection from the government. Allegiance is not peculiar to any one government or country; but is held to exist in every country and every government where there are any pretensions to any thing like order and institutions. It reaches the man of one complexion as much as that of another: it is held to be the ordination of the great parent of all society, fairly inferrible from the nature and necessity of human government. If allegiance is due from our colored population, its correlative is due from the government, viz. protection and equal laws. If allegiance is an ordination of heaven, it reaches, and binds and confers rights upon every man, within its range and rightful sway. Here, the free man of color may take his position, and upon the immutable principles of justice and truth demand his political rights, from that government which he is bound to aid and to defend; *he is not a citizen to obey, and an alien to demand protection.* Nor is he of an intermediate class; there is no trace of any such thing, in the history, the laws or institutions of this country. His relations to society are the same as others; his absolute and relative rights; his rights of person, and to things; his acquisitions of property by contract and by inheritance, even the soil, which no alien inherits, are the same: so every requisition of the law, in its civil and criminal provisions, reaches him: so his legal capabilities and his legal obligations are the same.—Every favor or right conferred on the citizens by general legislation reaches *him*;—so every requisition demands his obedience. To talk then of a class of non descript people among us, under these circumstances; to make a new classification, of half citizen and half alien, is equally against reason, justice, and policy.

This doctrine of natural allegiance has at various times received the attention of the courts in this country. In the case of Talbot vs. Jonson, 3 Dallas 133, the Supreme Court of the U. States in 1795 went far towards recognizing the doctrine in its fullest extent. So again in 1797, the late Chief Justice Ellsworth and Judge Low, in the case of Isaac Williams, held that their allegiance was *absolute*; their language is, 'the compact between the community and its members was, that the community should protect its members, and that the members should at all times be obedient to the laws of the community and faithful to its defence.'—Cited in 2 Cranch, 82, note. In the case of Murray vs. the Charming Betsey 2 Cranch 64, the Supreme Court of the U. States again pretty fully intimated the like opinion. So again in 1822, in the case of the Santissima Trinidad, 7 Whea. 283. Chancellor Kent says, from the historical review of the principal discussions in the Federal Courts on this interesting subject, in American jurisprudence, the better opinion would seem to be, that a citizen cannot renounce his allegiance to the U. States without the permission of government, to be declared by law. The same doctrine has been laid down in 20 John. 188. Jackson ex dem Smith vs. Goodell.

We will now pass from the doctrine of natural allegiance, which embraces *all*, without distinction of color, to the constitutions of the native states of these pupils; for the question is, Are they citizens of *those States?* If I am correct thus far, and we do not find in their constitutions any deprivation of fundamental rights attached to color, we may justly say there is no distinction. The 9 art. of the constitution of Pennsylvania declares, 'That all men are born equally free and independent, and have certain inherent and indefensible rights, among which are those of enjoying and defending life and liberty, of acquiring, possessing and protecting property and reputation, and of pursuing their own happiness.' No slavery nor distinction of color in fundamental rights exists in the land of Penn; not even in the matter of voting, as may be seen from the 1 sec. of art. 3. though as I shall hereafter shew, the right of suffrage and of citizenship, have no natural or necessary connection with each other.

The constitution of New-York contains no general declaration of the rights of the people, unless it may be the 1 sec. of 7 art. 'no member of this state shall be disfranchised or deprived of any of the rights or privileges secured to any citizen thereof, unless by the law of the land on the judgment of his peers.' In the matter of voting, the 2 art. declares, that citizen shall have the vote, though in the latter part of the same section, property and longer residence are required in the case of a '*colored citizen*,' so specifically called. The constitution of Rhode Island is the charter given them by Charles II. and embraces 'all the people that do or hereafter shall inhabit or be within the same.' I see no distinction in the *constitutional* rights of the people, and as to voting, I understand it is confined, by statute, to freeholders and the oldest sons of freeholders.

Again, there is nothing in the *constitution of the U. States*, nor in the legislation of Congress, to countenance the distinction of color. Let us go back to the articles of confederation: art. 4. sec. 1, is in these words: 'The better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people of the different states in this union, the *free inhabitants* of each of these states, paupers, vagabonds and refugees from justice excepted, shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of *free citizens* in the several states: and the people in each state shall have free ingress and egress, &c.' Here, then, *all free inhabitants* were included and secured, without the exception of paupers, &c., and secured too, in 'all the privileges and immunities of *free citizens*.' Can we suppose that when the constitution of the U. States was afterwards formed, for the same purposes as already expressed, to make more perfect the union of the states, and to do away more fully the idea of distinct nations here, and omitting too the excepted classes in the articles of confederation, paupers, &c., that it was in the power of the constitution, which is in these words: 'The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states;' narrowed the classes of the people to be protected from alienage and its consequences; and at once raised up a new species of human beings in these states. The provision of the constitution is very short, but it embraces all that its parent provision did, and more. It is worthy of remark, that after the articles of confederation were reported to the states for their approval, that the state of South Carolina instructed her delegates in Congress to propose an amendment, which was done as appears from the Journal, 25 June, 1778, where we find this entry: 'The delegates from South Carolina being called on, moved the following amendment, in behalf of their state—1st in article 4, between the words free inhabitants, insert, 'white,' passed in the negative, ayes 2; noes 8; divided I. The colored population, who are free to pursue their interests, come within the salutary effect of this clause in the constitution. It was early discovered that so intimate and intermingled were the people and their interests in these states, separated only by an imaginary line, not unfrequently dividing the same farm and the same neighborhood, that alienage among them could not be endured; hence it was the design of the constitution to make one nation, to the extent of the general powers of the government; to declare a citizen of one state, to be a citizen of every state; and as such, to clothe him with the same fundamental rights, be he where he might, which he acquired by birth in particular states; hence too we find, that judgments of the states are placed upon the ground of domestic proceedings. Do not our colored population need to be rescued from alienage in the prosecution and protection of their rights and interests, as much as others? They are in number, by the last census, 319,559. Some of them are possessed of property, and all of them of the same general rights with other citizens.

Again, by the constitution of the United States, color is no disqualification or impediment to naturalization. Congress can as well naturalize Asiatics, South Americans, Africans, as Europeans. There is no *constitutional* distinction—all legislation can be adopted; but if our own colored population are not already citizens, they cannot be made so by Congress, and are worse than foreigners.

Again, *all free* persons alike constitute the *representative* mass of the people. The language of the constitution is, 'Representatives and direct taxes shall be apportioned among the several states which may be included in this Union, according to their respective numbers, which shall be determined by adding to the whole number of *free persons*,' &c., art. 1. sec. 2. The represented mass is the true source of sovereignty; to them is due the allegiance and service of the citizens.

Again, Does not the judicial as well as the legislative power of the constitution extend to people of color? Among others, the judicial power is declared to extend to 'controversies between a state and citizens of another state; between citizens of different states: between citizens of the same state claiming lands under grants from different states; between a state and foreign citizens thereof, and foreign states, citizens or subjects.' Now, I ask if a man of color in New-York or Pennsylvania should sue a white citizen of Connecticut in their Federal Court, would it be a good plea in abatement that one of the parties is a man of color? Art. 3. sec. 2.

So the act of Feb. 21, 1793, granting patents for useful improvements, authorizes the issuing of a patent only to a 'citizen:' can not a man of color obtain one? Such has been done, and he would be a bold officer, who should refuse one, on the ground of color. The act of 1831, on the subject of copy-right, is of the same character.

So the act of December 31, 1792, concerning the registering and recording of ships or vessels. It is enacted, that no vessel shall be considered or treated as an American vessel, unless she is *owned and commanded* by an 'American citizen;'—men of color have owned vessels, and they have always been considered American vessels.

So the act of Feb. 18, 1793, for enrolling and licensing vessels for the coasting trade and the fisheries, a like oath must be taken by the owner, before she can be permitted to engage in the same—a 'citizen' only, can do it; but cannot, and have not men of color?

So the militia law uses the words, 'able male citizens; implying that there are other citizens besides white ones; for else the word citizens would have been omitted. If not colored people are exempt from military duty, but so are all persons under 18 or over 45, and all females; but, yet, Congress can call *all these* into the army or navy, or militia; and none will contend that exemption from military service proves political inferiority.

So the act of May 15, 1820, makes it criminal for a '*citizen*' to engage in the slave-trade. Can people of color do this? Art. 1? And yet penal laws are construed strictly.

So the act of May 28, 1796, for the relief and protection of American seamen, declares that any 'citizen' sailor can obtain from the custom house officer, a certificate of his citizenship; men of color have often done this, and can again.

So the act of July 20, 1790, for the regulation of seamen in the merchant's service, provides, that every ship or vessel belonging to a '*citizen or citizens*' of the U. States, of a certain burthen, on a foreign voyage, shall, under a severe penalty, be provided with a medicine chest. Are not men of color bound to comply with this law?

So all the intercourse laws with the Indians, where they forbid any '*citizen*,' from trading with the Indians without license, evidently reach people of color.

So it is worthy of remark that all our treaties with foreign nations, use the words *citizen of the United States*, as touching all our inhabitants, either in the imposition of new duties or the repeal of former ones.

These cases are enough to show that Congress, in its legislation, does not recognise the distinction of color; and I will venture to say that there is no one case, where the word '*citizen*' is used in the law of these states, but people of color are included, however penal and severe are its sanctions. Now all this would be inconsistent with the idea that people of color are not citizens; for it would create a new class of human beings, neither one thing nor another.

Again, when Missouri was admitted into the Union, there was a clause in her constitution requiring the legislature to make laws to prohibit free negroes and mulattoes from coming into the state. Congress required, as a condition of her admission, that no law should be passed to keep out of the state any citizens of the U. States; this, though not decisive, is strong evidence of the sense of Congress, as to the character of people of color. Sarg. Con. Law. 385.

Looking, then, to the doctrine of natural allegiance—to the articles of confederation—the constitution of the U. States—the legislative declarations of Congress—the treaties of the nation—the constitutions of the three states, in which these pupils were born, or the general sense of the country as to all free people; there is no reason to believe these pupils are not citizens in their birthplace—and, if citizens there, then by the constitution of the U. States they are entitled to 'all the immunities and privileges of the citizens of Connecticut,' under like circumstances. I might say, perhaps, *any* citizens, but I have no occasion to ask for more than is in the state allowed to our colored population; as by our constitution, colored people, born here, cannot vote; and hence, to that extent, we make a distinction founded on color. I have no occasion to put a colored citizen of New-York, on higher ground than our own, and therefore, I add, 'under like circumstances.'

If it were important to prove that colored people born in Connecticut are citizens, I should urge the same considerations already stated; and further, I should urge some provisions in our constitution, viz. art. 1, sec. 1, 'that all men are equal in rights,' which is no fiction, but a solemn declaration, clear in its meaning, and to its full extent binding on this Court. I contend for equality in the political sense of the word, i. e. according to such circumstances as we have power to control. In these we are all equal, and we must conform to that rule of action as far as we possibly can.

So in section 5th, 'Every *citizen* may freely speak with and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible for the abuse of that liberty.

So in section 16th, The '*citizens* have a right in a peaceable manner to assemble for their common good, and to apply to those invested with power, by petition, for redress of grievances or other proper provisions by petition, address or remonstrance.'

So in section 17th, 'Every *citizen* has a right to bear arms in defence of himself and the state.'

Do not all these privileges and securities extend to the colored population? But they extend only to *citizens*, and not to any mongrel intermediate class. If there be any,

Again, in that part of the constitution, which speaks of the elective franchise; art. 6, sec. 2, the words are, 'every *white* male citizen,' the word white is superfluous, if there are none but white citizens.*

* In the state of New-York, in the convention held in 1821 to form a new constitution, the question was made, whether colored persons should not be denied the elective franchise; the determination was on *principle of right, to allow it to them.* In the progress of the discussion, we find the sentiments of some of the most distinguished citizens of that state. *Mr. Jay says*, 'Why, Sir, are these men to be excluded from rights which they possess in common with their countrymen? What crime have they committed, for which they should be punished? Why are they, who were born as free as our-

We will best consider the objections urged against us.

1st. Men of color cannot vote in Connecticut, and therefore they are not citizens of Connecticut.

Why, they can vote in Pennsylvania and New-York; if voting then is the criterion of citizenship, they are citizens there: besides, it appears from the constitutions of the states here before me, that colored people can vote in Maine, Massachusetts, Vermont, New Hampshire, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina, and Tennessee.

But again, voting is not the criterion of citizenship; it has no natural or necessary connection with it. Cases may occur where persons vote who are not citizens, and where persons are citizens and do not vote. Few men contend for universal and absolute suffrage. The right of choosing one's rulers is a valuable right; but perhaps it is not a natural so much as an artificial one, originating in, and regulated by, the sense of the community in which we live. Many considerations enter into its existence and enjoyment; such as age, property, residence, paying taxes, doing military duty. Teh right is founded in notions of internal police, varying and shifting every where, not even in the same government; whereas citizenship grows out of allegiance which is every where the same, and is unchanging. Persons sometime vote for one branch of the government only; as was lately the case in New York. *How much* of a citizen was such a voter? Once property was a necessary qualification in Connecticut. Were none but persons of property citizens? None but freeholders and the elder sons of freeholders can vote in Rhode Island, at this time. Are they alone citizens? Suppose a voter in Connecticut should lose his right of suffrage by reason of criminal conduct, as the law declares he shall, does he cease to be a *citizen?* Does he become an *alien?* What is he? No female can vote, nor any minor, but are they not *citizens?*

2d. What confusion, if voting makes a citizen—the aliens men, in one state, is a full citizen; in another, half a citizen; in another, a non descript; in another, an alien. Now how absurd to create such distinctions in these states; and besides, of two colored men in New-York, one is a citizen, because he vote, and one not, and otherwise just alike; one is a citizen and the other not—a father is a citizen, his son a non descript.

Again, if voting is the criterion of citizenship, then every person who has been naturalized, has a right to vote, for he is a citizen; but he cannot, of course, and must be qualified in other particulars. So the widow and children of a person who dies after he has applied for naturalization, but before he has obtained it, are declared citizens at once.

Suppose a state should allow a foreigner to vote who is not a citizen, he does not thereby become a citizen, for Congress only can make him such by a general law. The truth is, voting and citizenship have no natural relation to each other. If voters only are citizens, then we have twenty-four rules of citizenship in the U. States, and these are shifting from day to day, according to the notions of a dominant party, in every state.

I am by no means satisfied that the right of suffrage is one of the fundamental rights secured by the 4th art. of the constitution of the U. States. I will not say it is not, because if we qualify it, by giving it to the citizen of another state in *like circumstances with our own citizen*, we shall not be embarrassed by admitting that it is; but the rights of persons and of things do not seem to me necessarily to embrace the right of suffrage; and these are the privileges and immunities meant in the constitution.

On the trial below, the Chief Justice drew an argument against our idea of a 'citizen,' from Doctor Webster's dictionary. I do not believe it was the intention of Mr. Webster to use the word in any technical *legal sense*, as is most evident from all his definitions taken together. Gen. Jackson, at the battle of New Orleans, addressed the blacks as 'fellow citizens'; so the mayor of the city of New York, in his recent proclamation, addressed upon all the 'citizens' to aid in suppressing the mob; neither of them attached any exact meaning to the word. These are Webster's definitions, viz.

1st. 'The native of a City, or an inhabitant who enjoys the freedom and privileges of the City in which he resides. The freeman of a City, as distinguished from a foreigner, or one not entitled to its franchises.

2d. A Townsman; a man of trade, not a gentleman.

3d. An inhabitant; a dweller in a City, Town or place.

4th. In a general sense, a native or permanent resident in a City or Country.

5th. In the U. States, a person native or naturalized, who has the privilege of exercising the elective franchise, or the qualifications which enable him to vote for rulers, and to *purchase and hold real estate.*

'If the citizens of the U. States should not be free and happy, the fault will be entirely their own.' WASHINGTON.

This last definition, though it *excludes* these pupils, if voting and holding real estate, be the criterion, it excludes all white men, who are not voters—all minors and all women. Now, it is certain, General Washington did not use the word 'citizen,' in such a sense.

See Johnson and Walker's definitions.

1st. 'A freeman of a City.

2d. A Townsman.

3d. An Inhabitant.

Again, it is said Indians are not citizens, and hence an argument is drawn against us.

1st. These pupils are not Indians.

2d. Indians have hitherto been treated as members of national tribes, in alliance with the U. States, according to treaty stipulations and the intercourse law. They have been held to be without the *practical* jurisdiction of the states. But since Congress has withdrawn their ancient jurisdiction, and the states have extended theirs over these tribes, it is not certain that it is the exact political character of an Indian born within states. Even in New-York, before the late change in our Indian affairs, they were there decided to be 'citizens,' by a unanimous decision of the Supreme Court, on the ground of the State having jurisdiction; and the Indians owing allegiance. 20 John. 191. 2. 3.

Again, it is said, slaves are not citizens. These pupils are not slaves. The reason why slaves are not citizens is, because they are held to be '*property*,' and not men; and hence, have not freedom of choice or action. The reason does not reach these pupils. Color is cannot entitle, by law.

It is said, that in some of the states, we find laws prohibiting the intermarriage of whites and blacks. The law is a wise one; but then it proves nothing. Which party was the law made for? The inferior? Marriage and citizenship have no relation to each other; they are founded upon and regulated by different considerations. The legislature have a right, (if they please to exercise it,) to prevent persons marrying according to age, property, or profession, or color. Citizenship is founded in the tie of natural allegiance.

Chancellor Kent was cited against us, below. 2 Kent's Com. 30. 71. 2;—but there is nothing in his books to sanction the objection.

This is all I have to say upon the first point. I will next consider the second, viz. : Are these pupils are, by the 4th art. of the constitution of the U. States secured in the right for which they are now contending. The language of the provision in the constitution is as follows:—'The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.' 4 art. 2 sec.

In the consideration of this question, we may lay out of the case, the matter of color; it is really a question of constitutional control, or the obligation of a state to abide by the constitution as the supreme law of the land. If we may *regulate* one citizen of another state out of our territory, we may another; making color or complexion circumstances the rule, as it may please our legislature. If we may expel these colored citizens of New-York to-day, we may the white youth of New-York, in Yale College, to-morrow.

1st. The clear intent of this section is, to do away the character and consequences of *alienage*, among the citizens of these United States, to the extent of the reciprocity of the privileges and immunities secured, be they what they may. To *this* extent, a citizen of any state, is a citizen of *every* state. In the language of Judge Story, (2 Story's Com. 674,) the intention of this clause is to confer on them, if one may so say, a *general citizenship*, and communicate all the privileges and immunities which the citizens of the same state would be entitled to under the like circumstances.' If citizenship in a particular state, secures immunities and privileges, so by the constitution, a citizen of another state, may hold up the broad shield of this instrument to repel every attack fundied upon them. All men, if they were, members of one government, one state. And now let it not be forgotten, that whatever these immunities and privileges are, they are solemnly *secured* and *guaranteed* by the constitution; and let me add, it is the clear duty of this enlightened Court to see they are made so to these pupils, if citizens, as I have contended they are.

It was admitted, by the Court below, that the right of education is a *fundamental right*; and will it be questioned here? The Pope of Rome and the despots of Turkey may do it, but it will not be done in Connecticut. What right so justly valued by us? What so much applauded as the peculiar honor of our state, and so liberally secured and widely extended by the very constitution itself? How do the nations of the earth look upon Connecticut for want of it? and tyrants and despots and chieftains reign over mankind, through their ignorance and their superstition? *Education* is the first and fundamental pillar on which our free institutions rest; and it is the last privilege we will give up. And here let me add, that the restrictions of this law are exceedingly onerous and distressing to the parents of these pupils; shut out as these children are virtually from the benefits of education, they have *retired* to a place by themselves, in deference to the prevailing prejudice against them—here they have sought out a virtuous and competent teacher to instruct them in the elementary branches of education, spelling, reading, arithmetic, geography and the like; —their parents are able to do this—many of them are wealthy, and they feel, that by education their children will be happier and better fitted for usefulness among their depressed fellows, either here, or in Liberia. And who, *who* will rise up to oppose this effort? Let our opponents set openly; let them pass a law to immure in like ignorance the colored people of this state. Our own state, and not attempt the same thing, by selecting the blacks of other states, under the pretence that educating them will fill our state with a vicious and pauper population. The moral sentiments of this community will not sanction the idea that a man of color shall not have, like others, the *right* to direct, according to his ability, the education of his children. Mr. Wilberforce, aided by many benevolent individuals, established a seminary for colored people at Clapham, a short distance from London. Miss Crandall need not be ashamed to imitate his example. The people of this country forced the ancestors of our colored population from Africa; they have since kept their descendants in bonds and darkness, and now talk of *right*, founded in the color and degradation of the negro, as a justification for continued wrong, and the deprivation, this day attempted, on principle and morality.

Now I tell this honorable Court, that we owe a debt to the colored population of this country, which we can never pay,—no, never, never, unless we can call back oceans of tears, and the groans and agonies of the middle passage, and the thousands and millions of human beings, whom we have sent, and are sending, ignorant, debased and unclean, to eternity.

In the 4 Wash. Ci. Ct. R. 380. Canfield *vs.* Cargell, we have the following remarks of the Court, delivered by Washington the presiding Judge, upon the clause of the constitution now in question. 'The next question is, whether this act (a law of New Jersey) infringes that section of the constitution which declares, 'that the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.' 'The inquiry is, what are the privileges and immunities, of citizens in the several states?' 'We feel no hesitation in confining these expressions to those privileges and immunities, which are in their nature fundamental, which belong of right to the citizens of all free governments; and which have at all times been enjoyed, by the citizens of the several states which compose this Union, from the time of their becoming free, independent and sovereign. What these fundemental principles are, it would, perhaps, be more tedious than difficult to enumerate. The right of a citizen of one state to pass through or *reside* in any other state, for purposes of *trade, agriculture, professional pursuits*, or *otherwise*, are among the rights secured.' These and many others which might be mentioned, are, strictly speaking, privileges and immunities, and the enjoyment of them by the citizen of each state, in every other state, was manifestly calculated, (to use the expressions of the preamble of the corresponding provision in the articles of confederation,) 'the better to secure and perpetuate mutual friendship and intercourse among the people of the different states of the Union.'

So in 3 Story's Com. 674, we read, 'The provision is expressed in plain and simple in its language, and its object is not easily to be misunderstood. Connected with the exclusive power of naturalization in the general government, it puts at rest many of the difficulties which affected the construction of the articles of confederation. It is obvious if the citizens of each state were to be deemed aliens to each other, they could not take or hold real estate, or other privileges, except as other aliens. The intention of this clause was to confer on them, if one may so say, a general citizenship, and communicate all the privileges and immunities which the citizens of the same state would be entitled to under the like circumstances.'

Chancellor Kent, 2 Kent's Com. 61, says, 'If citizens of one state remove to another, they are entitled to the privileges that persons of the same description are entitled to in the state to which the removal is made, and to none other. If, therefore, for instance, free persons of color are not entitled to vote in Carolina; free persons of color emigrating there from a northern state, would not be entitled to vote. The law of each state ought and must govern within its jurisdiction, and the laws and usages of our state cannot be permitted to prescribe qualifications for citizens, to be claimed and exercised in other states in contravention to their local policy.'

From a consideration of these authorities, and from a perusal of the clause in the constitution, we must admit, that

1st. That a citizen of another state, may come here to *reside*, without being fined, whipped, or laid under peculiar exactions: this right is secured to him, if any thing is secured. He must have a right to do what citizens may do, under like circumstances. But if he may come here to reside, it would seem to follow, that he may do as others may do, else why come at all? Like others, he may engage in agriculture, trade, or a profession, or bind himself out to learn a trade. Can he be compelled, merely because he is not *born here*, to obtain leave of the town, to come or remain here? If they may do so, they may *withhold* it, and what becomes of the right? It is no *right*, but a *favor*. If he may not educate his children as others may do, it is no *right*, whatever else is meant by it. If immunities and privileges are the same, then a law founded on the distinction of birth in another state, is in the teeth of the constitution. May not a citizen remove to Ohio, and there live and act as other citizens do? Can any doubt, I may be sure say to him, you are an alien, we will prescribe the *size of your farm*, the *manner of its cultivation*, and the *mode of teaching your children*, while others are excepted? Is it any barrier against the people of Massachusetts because *they are people of Massachusetts?* and may they not come in and settle among us and pursue husbandry, merchandize, manufactures, the arts or acquisition of knowledge, without getting license from the town or legislature? The law must be alike and general, or there is an end of equal privileges and immunities.

Now, what is the law under consideration? It forbids a citizen of another state from coming here, to pursue education, as all others may do, *because* he has not a *legal settlement in the state.* • It is a crime to feed him, to teach him, and it is made so, if the parent be made equally so to sell a farm or rent a house to him, or in any way to aid a citizen of another state, who wished to establish himself in Connecticut. This power of regulation, is a power of *alienage*, virtually a power of *exclusion*, and in this case is, in effect, and was designed so to be. As well might the legislature, in order to raise up a more beautiful or vigorous generation of citizens, prohibit the harboring or entertaining of any citizen from the other states, who was not six feet high, or had not a well proportioned body, or black eyes, or a clear skin. In the case of *M. Collinch vs. State of Maryland*, the 4 Wheat. 431, Chief Justice Marshall says, in giving the opinion of the Court, 'that the power to tax, involves the power to destroy; that the power to destroy may defeat and frustrate the power to create; that there is a plain repugnance, in conferring on one government a power to control the constitutional measures of another, which other, with respect to those very measures, is declared to be supreme over that which exerts the control. are propositions not to be denied. But all inconsistencies are to be reconciled by the magic of the word *confidence*, &c. If the power claimed does exist, then I say, the legislature has power to *regulate* every white youth at Yale College, being citizens of other states, out of our borders, as *aliens*. The question is not one of color, but of power, to be exercised according to the *pleasure* of the legislature. If indeed this power exists, such proofs can just as well be prohibited all *entrance* into the state, as be removed or *regulated* away after they have come here.

But it is asked,—May we not keep out of Connecticut, paupers and vagabonds, and such like? Not such laws of long standing?

There is an excellent provision in our statute book, (to be found in the present edition, at page 221,) authorising the civil authority of each town to issue a warrant for the purpose of driving *all such persons*, not born in the state of Connecticut, who comes to reside in it, and if need be, to follow up this order by whipping, nor shall any such person be here entertained, without the consent of their first given security to the town, that the individual shall never become chargeable to the town. The present law contains a like provision for removing.

As to this ancient statute, my first remark is, that it was passed before the adoption of the articles of confederation, or the present constitution of the United States; when this state had a right to exclude the citizens of other states or colonies, for they then stood in no other relation one *alienc*. I find these provisions in an edition of laws as early as 1750.

My second remark is, that this law is contrary to the constitution of the United States, and I am quite sure it will not be so maintained. If the 4 art. sec. 2, means any thing, it does secure to a citizen of New-York a right to come here, and *remain* here, if he offends against no general law: he cannot be whipped out over the heads of the state because he has no legal settlement: he may present the shield of the constitution, and as Paul claimed the immunity of a Roman citizen, he may say, I am a citizen of another state may be expelled from our territory, even though most excellent and desirable, because he or his posterity, in some *remote generation*, may become poor, and burdensome to the state, if they do as it pleases in supporting them: *this is a repeal of the constitution.* Neither present nor future poverty can strike out of the constitution the word 'citizen,' and a 'citizen' has a general right, (the right of locomotion,) to *residence*, and other fundamental rights. So the state may guard itself against thieves from without or within, by punishing them for crimes committed in our territory, or enacting that the property, wherever it is, shall be that if can prohibit a '*citizen of the United States*' from entering this state and remaining in it, because he has offended elsewhere, or may offend again. If he has fled from justice and is demanded by the constitution, he must be delivered up, but while he is here, unoffending, the state cannot drive him out, nor make it penal to supply his necessities *here*: it could, were it not for the constitution of the U. States: *he is a citizen, and that is his protection.*

We may learn much by looking at the articles of confederation, and the alteration of the same, in the particulars under considerations. In the 4 article, 'paupers, vagabonds and fugitives from justice,' are excepted, in the security of the immunities and privileges secured to other citizens; but in the constitution the exception is gone, and no provision is made for delivering up 'fugitives from justice;' the others are placed on the same footing with citizens, and so are fugitives, until they are demanded. Now, this power of state policy, of excluding citizens of other states, just according to the notions of our legislature in raising up a particular population, is a restoration to the constitution of the U. States the *very excepted classes* we have been speaking of. Indeed, it is going much further, for it is making the entrance and residence of a citizen of another state, here, dependent upon the notions and pleasure of our own legislature.

The language of the constitution, art. 4. sec. 2, is *universal* and *unqualified*: it says *every* citizen. Apprehension of pauperism or crime, pretended or real, cannot be made the foundation of a constitutional law.

Indeed, the impracticability of carrying the exceptions, in the articles of confederation into effect, is reason enough for their omission. Who is a pauper, or vagabond? What is the criterion of such a condition? At what exact time must it exist? Must the person be such when he comes, before, or after? And what are his rights in the mean time? Can he claim an application to some public officer for relief? And as to refugees, suppose a person in South Carolina has broken a law which forbids him to teach his slaves to read, and flees here, and is demanded, is he a fair mark long an offender, and treat him as an alien? Were it not for the constitution, we would no more deliver him up, then we would one of the noble Poles, lately landed on our shores, fleeing from impious resentment. Of all, *all* citizens, I say, they are in *their* country, be they in it where they will: they have one *common tie*, one *allegiance*, and one *citizenship*. But while it is urged that the state has power to bind up the rights of citizens out of this state; it should be remembered that it does not propose to keep paupers or colored citizens out of this state; this would have been too flagrant a violation of our own laws, they shall not be *educated*, for fear we shall have a dangerous and vicious population!

But it is asked, may not the legislature superintend our schools, and has not this already been done?

I do not doubt, but that the legislature may superintend public schools; for they are instituted by the legislature, and sustained by public money: nor do I doubt, but that the legislature may prohibit any other or private schools, as it does trades, professions, taverners, merchants, and may *all* the pursuits of the citizens; but then this must be done by a general and equal law. Mere *birth* is another state cannot be relied upon, as ground of distinction, discrimination and deprivation;—this is alienage, and is not consistent with the paramount authority, that the citizens of each state shall be entitled to all privileges and immunities of citizens in the several states.' Can we say that no man shall be a lawyer, or doctor, or farmer, *because* he was born in Massachusetts?

It is said a law like this has been in force in Ohio, for some years. The provisions of that law, I do not know, nor can I learn that they have ever received the sanction of judicial authority; and I trust they never will. There was a law like this in South Carolina, and the Circuit Court of the United States, there, held it unconstitutional and void; but as the colored persons there, were taken out of an English ship, I do not know but that treaty with England had some influence upon the decision, though I do not know that it had.

The truth is, there is nothing in the settled law of any free state in the Union to countenance the provisions of this obnoxious law. Though, however, may be found in the statutes of the slave states. For instance, the legislature of Louisiana have enacted, 'that whoeover shall make use of language, in any public place, from the bar, the bench, the pulpit, the stage, or in any *other place whatsoever*, shall make use of language in any private discourses, or shall make use of *signs* or actions, having a *tendency* to produce *discontent* among the colored population, shall suffer imprisonment at hard labor, not less than *three years*, nor more than *twenty-one years*, or *death*, at the *discretion* of the Court.' It has also prohibited the instruction of blacks in *Sabbath Schools*, $500 for the *first* offence, *Death* for the second. Our law imposes a penalty of $100 for teaching a colored person in a *Sabbath School*, (having no legal settlement in this state) and $200 for the second offence. In Virginia, 'all meetings of negroes, at any school house or *meeting house* for teaching them writing or *reading*,' are declared an unlawful assembly. These laws are all of a kindred character; they call for severe and denunciation, and well may we be fearful, that a righteous God will not let them pass unheeded or unrevenged. And how, let me ask, can excitement be kept down, in the south, while such laws and cruel laws are enforced against human beings like ourselves, of the same feelings, destiny, and hopes? I regret most deeply, that the legislature of Connecticut should give any countenance to such laws, and heavily contribute add to the darkness that rests upon these neglected minds. The passage of the law in question, in Connecticut, so distinguished for her republican feeling, and her attachment to the principles of liberty, has been a matter of astonishment and unfeigned sorrow throughout thid country: nor has it escaped the notice and regret of the people in England. It was an unlucky hour when it was devised and passed—passed inconsiderately, I doubt not.

The general policy of this law, as well as its connection with the subject of slavery,—that greatest curse and blight upon our country, and the greatest wrong and shame in our world,—though matters of deep and everlasting interest to us, to our children, to our free institutions, cannot, I am aware, be properly discussed here. The law is not defensible, even, but for its unconstitutionality. Had I been a member of the legislature, I should have raised my voice against it. It is a most wanton and uncalled for attack upon our colored population; it must wound not easily healed; it exasperates to madness many who live among us; it strengthens the unreasonable prejudice already pervading the community against blacks;—and, in short, it rivets the chains of the benighted bondman, and adds fuel to the unholy cause of slavery itself. Deep, deep, are the feelings this moment pervading the slave states. The moral example of England in her late act of emancipation,—the benign effects of the emancipation of her slaves in the West Indies; the injustice and high offence against heaven of slavery itself, are spreading a gloom over the South, more awful and foreboding than any that have been told; and, if I see aright, I am pained to say, any serious movements for melioration or relief in *that* quarter. Slavery is a volcano, the fires of which cannot be extinguished, and its ravages continued, we already feel its convulsions; and if we sit idly gazing upon its flames, as they rise higher and higher, our happy republic will be buried in ruin, beneath its overwhelming energies.

COMMUNICATIONS.

FIREBRANDS, INCENDIARIES, AND FANATICS.

Every mode which can be devised, is adopted, to obscure the true questions respecting slavery in the United States. Prudence, expediency, safety, rebellion, property, fire, compensation, slaughter, and every other bugbear which such cunning dog-fa faced ambigo,[1] as the Editor of the New-York Commercial Advertiser and the Reviewer of Colonization in the Methodist Quarterly can invent, are presented in full view, expressly to bewilder the ignorant, to cajole the honest, and to frighten the timid. All the questions respecting slavery are comprised in one simple fact, that *slavery is a compound of all the highest crimes which can be committed against both God and man; and that every slaveholder is involved in damning guiltiness.* The first question, then, is, shall it be done? Is it wise, is it expedient, and not what will gratify the avarice and ambition of Carolina and Georgia men-stealing profligates; but what are the claims of justice and christianity?

Is it overweening for righteous, to talk of abolishing it as manifestly unjust; and if slavery is reconcilable with christianity, there is no necessity to amend it. Every man who defends the prolongation of slavery, for one moment, longer than the thrilling sound of *liberty, for all* can be proclaimed from the Hudson to the gulf of Mexico; to be consistent, must contend for its existence, upon the assumption that slavery is a part of the system of moral integrity which includes the exercise of christian virtues. The Editor of the Commercial Advertiser seems to doubt or deny both the equity and the religious propriety of slaveholding, and yet he vociferously denounces as '*firebrands, incendiaries and fanatics*,' all those who plead for an immediate extirpation of an extensive population, who are groaning under the lash, and for the instant abolition of a legalized system of man-stealing, rape, murder, and every other crime which Satan instigates his faithful servants, all slaveholders, constantly to perpetrate.

This same editor, in his usual 'smooth-ways,' as honest John Bunyan denominates all such persons as the Editor of the N. Y. Commercial Advertiser, (who reproaches the 'heavy capitalist,' calumniates the Editors of the Liberator and Emancipator, and villifies all those who believe that slavery is a damning crime, and therefore ought instantly to be terminated, and yet deceitfully prates respecting his opposition to slavery;) has recently given a remarkable proof of his attachment to the colored people, and his hatred of the slave system.

A Society has recently been organized in New-York for the melioration of the condition of the colored people. Among the Managers are some of those citizens, whose exertions in behalf of an injured race are known to all the country. The object of the Society is only in its infancy, but the Managers are expediting with all despatch the measures which may accomplish the grand design. Among other means, a suggestion was made that it might be well to establish a school for the benefit of familiar lectures upon some popular subject, and Monday evening was selected for that object. The school room belonging to the Mannumission Society was selected for the colored people to assemble; and the Rev. Peter William, on behalf of his friends, applied to the Rev. Mr. Bourne, whose zeal and sufferings in this cause are known through all the country, to deliver a weekly lecture upon modern history. To this proposal he consented. The Editor of the New-York Commercial Advertiser is one of the persons who has a partial control over the occupancy of a house—and after the consent of the owner had been obtained, that Editor remonstrated in the name of Liberator, 'I fad I know who it was that gave the house to deliver lectures, I would not have my consent.' Mr. Bell inquired—'Why? Mr. Bourne able to deliver the lectures and instruct us in history!' To this the Editor of the Commercial Advertiser replied—'I fad I am trying to say against his learning, but I'm sure his character!'

Now I ask, what sincerity can there be in a man who professes kindness to the colored people, and yet would hinder their intellectual improvement, when not only they are benefitted, but, when probably no other person in the city of New-York would have engaged in the arduous and self-denying employment? What has Bourne's divinity to do with ten or twenty thousand historical lectures, from which all reference to Christian theology and ecclesiastical annals are carefully excluded? What knowledge of divinity can he have, who maintains that to inculcate the moral fulfilment of our duty as consistent citizens, is nothing of higher claims, is to scatter firebrands? What corrupt, erroneous or muddled idea of the gospel must the Editor of the Commercial Advertiser possess, who publishes that that man, who asserts self-evident truths of the sacred volume, is a 'firebrand and fanatic'? But to make Mr. Bourne divinity,—of which we are certain that the Editor knows no more than he does of sincerity and moral justice, if his doings respectably prove the criterion of judgment,—to make Mr. Bourne divinity an excuse for taking away the key of knowledge from the coloured people, is too contemptible, too malignant, and especially by a man who professes to belong not only to the same body of christians, but to the same presbytery. We advise the Editor, therefore, if he does not like Mr. Bourne's divinity, to arraign him as a heretic before his own presbytery, and if he does not 'catch a Tartar,' we are deceived.

We should not have adverted to these things were it not plain proof of the incurable hatred towards the coloured people which all those who are colonizers or negro-slaveholders possess; and the deadly opposition which they make to every measure that is adopted to enlarge their minds, improve their morals, augment their comforts, and ennoble their souls. Excluding the New-Haven folly and weakness in almost forcibly destroying the asylum for the benefit of talented youth of colour, the malignity in New-York, combined with the silly like proceedings towards Miss Crandall at Canterbury, demonstrate, beyond all possibility of doubt, that the boasted philanthropy of the colonizers, is less than nothing—than vanity. In Connecticut, we propose to re-enact one of the most stained and the Gothic items of feudal vassalage, namely, to obstruct the education of coloured girls; and in other parts of the colonies transporting men in New-York, one of their most blasphemous acts would have hindered a large assembly, which we are informed is now collected every Monday evening in that city, from being instructed in one of the most useful departments of literature under the ignominious pretext, that a minister of the gospel, not preach divinity to please a time-serving politician.

All the deceitful speechifying and all the pious misrepresentations of the two-tongued agents of colonization, and all the cant of those who profess to be colleagued with them, are not only vain, but they are also as mischievous as they are wrong. Mr. Dunforth reviles christian philanthropists as having more 'blood than brains.' The Editor of the New-York Commercial Advertiser, and others, are exclusively devoted to demolish kidnapping and maintain gospel liberty, are firebrands; and the ministers of the New Testament are ignorant men; and all such citizens who concerate their time, active services and their property to the melioration of their fellow immortals, and to elevate their country from the stigma of legalizing the most atrocious criminality, and of honoring the most abominable transgressors, are incendiaries. The man who Rev. Dr. Boardman of Glasgow characterized, at the late anti-slavery meeting in that city, as

'THE DOOR-KEEPERS OF THE HELL OF SLAVERY.'

There is now a young coloured gentleman of beauty pursuing his studies at the University of Glasgow, preparing to act as missionary among his coloured brethren in the dignified youth of Scotland, a standing proof of the barbarity which debases our country, and a living demonstration of that iniquity which palmed on 'paradoxical republic,' that drives its sacred ministers to Britain to procure that knowledge which are fraudulently denied them in their own land. To the christians who would impart to the gifted coloured youth desirable wisdom, are branded by these door-keepers of the hell of slavery' as 'firebrands, incendiaries and fanatics,' with more blood than hands by men who are employed in continually deceiving the public, that the fetters of the slave may be more firmly riveted, and that the home market may be supplied with human cattle.

As we are classed among the insane fanatics and incendiaries; and as it is impossible for the Editors, and their minions, the Editor of the Commercial Advertiser, the *pure* Methodist Reviewer, and the agents of the human flesh shipping merchants, alias the Colonization Society, either to have a conscience or shun they do, until the grace of God converts them; we have kindled another Firebrand for them; and now burl it among them, with the fervent prayer that it may burn up all their deceitfulness, calumny, and opposition to truth, justice and christian liberty. The Colonization Society is one of the most artful and complete inventions of infernal ingenuity to increase and perpetuate the existing system of slavery. This fact all the agents and all the ministers pouring laudatory addresses well know; and if both the pray preachers or others who do not know it, it is because they are voluntarily ignorant. Every coloured person in our northern States who gives money or offers benefactions to the American Colonization Society, with a view to aid positive citizens in Africa, renders no more true philanthropy than if he were to employ his neighboring blacksmith to forge irons for the dollars, iron hand-cuffs, and iron leg-locks, for his southern coloured people. He might as well employ the sadder to make coffins for his friends, and consecrate their lacceration, and then transmit the mutilated scourges, to be divided among the different counties, according to the number of slaves, to kindred souls whom the task-masters retain in the kingdom of slavery.

Those agents, and those editors, and those reviewers, for they are all alike ensnaring and pernicious so far as the colored people are concerned, know that to talk of delivering our country from the colored population,[2] by the present colonization system, is the wildest fantasy than any one of the adventures of Don Quixote—and to engage in promoting that farce, is an impeachment of a large portion of mind or moral honesty.

The fact must be told and must be reiterated until it is understood, and is operative in producing good works. As long as the colored people are poor, and so long will they increase in a prodigious ratio, the market will be supplied as long as lust, intemperance and sensuality thus so ardently pant for the fated. Multitudes of young women are kept in the southern States expressly for producing children. They are bought, sold, and retained by the ruffians, under the name of BREEDING WOMEN; and they are indulged in many trifling gratifications which cost nothing, provided they annually present the slave trader an addition to his merchantable troop of human cattle. This filthy system will continue so long as children like colts are held to be of a certain value before their birth; when born, and so long as the increasing price as they grow in size and strength, and in their energy.

[1] 'Ambiguous, equivocal, deceitful.'

[2] 'Paradoxical republic,' that drives its sacred ministers to Britain to procure that knowledge which are fraudulently denied them in their own land. To the christians who would impart to the gifted coloured youth desirable wisdom, are branded by these door-keepers of the hell of slavery' as 'firebrands, incendiaries and fanatics,' with more blood than hands by men who are employed in continually deceiving the public, that the fetters of the slave may be more firmly riveted, and that the home market may be supplied with human cattle.

BOSTON,
SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1834.

PRIDE'S LABOR LOST.

'A new organization of the friends of slavery, will probably come into existence ere long'.—*Boston Recorder, Aug. 15, 1834.*

☞ For the last six months, an active correspondence, we have reason to believe, has been going on between the friends of the Colonization Society, of the Colonization Society, for the purpose of effecting the organization above alluded to—to be made up of those who despair alike of banishing the colored inhabitants of this country to the shores of Africa, and of keeping them in perpetual vassalage here, and who are too proud and too obstinate to make confession of their errors, and cordially unite with the friends of immediate emancipation. Thus far at least, the monstrous in labor has brought forth a mountain-say, great as has been its travail, it has brought forth *nothing*. What new path in ethics these *go-betweens* expect to find, hitherto untrodden by either of the great conflicting parties, and necessarily common ground between slavery and freedom, we are as much at a loss to conceive, as they are to find it. They have too much conscience longer to remain in the broad road of unrighteousness, and too little to induce them to enter the straight and narrow path of christian equality. They contend for opening a new and better route, which shall be neither broad nor narrow, thus avoiding the extremes of the other two. Whether they intend to make a tunnel under the earth, or expect to make an aerial turnpike—whether they have begun their excursions, or taken any surveys, or obtained an adequate capital, we are not in the secret and cannot tell, but most look for information to the Boston Recorder, or Christian Mirror, or some other organ of these sage projectors. We have waited as patiently as the necessity of action would permit, for this development—spring, with its buds and blossoms, has come and gone—the fruits of summer have ripened and been gathered—autumn is swiftly passing away—but yet there is no announcement of a new organization, except that it '*will probably* come into existence ere long.' It will be hard digging in the winter, if, as we have hinted, a tunnel is to be made; and all experiments in the air will be hazardous at that inclement season. Certainly, if they mean to do any thing, their delay is inexcusable.

Seriously—it is pitiable to see men of intelligence, of station, and, in despite of their moral obliquities, of piety, haughtily scorning to concede that they are fallible, and that they have been in judgment, and vainly imagining that they shall be able to discover a middle course between right and wrong, liberty and oppression, obedience and rebellion. All their plans and experiments will fail. Let them, in the liberal and lofty spirit of Christianity, renounce their malignant and vulgar prejudices—let them not palliate the sin of oppression—let them regard the poor bondman as 'a man and a brother'—and throw the mighty weight of their talent, reputation, influence and zeal, into the scale of immediate and universal emancipation, and of equal rights and privileges.

PROGRESS OF MANUMISSION IN MARYLAND.

The increase of the free colored population of Maryland from 1790 to 1800, was 148 per cent.

From 1800 to 1810, it was 70 per cent.

From 1810 to 1820, it was about 19 per cent.

From 1820 to 1830, it was 33 1-3 per cent.

For a period of 20 years—i. e. from 1790 to 1810, it was 429 per cent. or 21 per ct. per annum. During this period, the scheme of African colonization was not in existence.

For the same period of time—i. e. from 1810 to 1830, it was only ☞ 56 per cent. or not quite 3 per ct. per annum!—At an early period of this term, the American Colonization Society was formed, and strongly countenanced by Maryland and Virginia.

The disparity in the number of manumissions in these two cases is equally remarkable and afflicting. Does it, or does it not, furnish a criterion by which we may judge of the influence of the Colonization Society upon slavery? If it be asserted that Society was organized, the rate of increase of the free colored people in Maryland was 21 per ct. per annum, and if since that time it has been less than 3 per ct., is it not a strong proof rather that the Society is a formidable hindrance, than a help, to emancipation? It is said that figures cannot lie.

At the close of the revolutionary war, and for a number of years subsequently, there was a tender conscience and great shame felt in the land, in view of the inconsistency of holding christian slaves in bondage. The fire of SEVENTY-SIX, which had melted the fetters of our fathers, was not suddenly extinguished. For a long time it had sufficient intensity to melt other and heavier chains; and the consequence was, that up to the second census of our population, the spirit of emancipation was active in undoing the heavy burdens and setting the captives free. Alarmed at the rapid increase of the free colored population, the adherents to slavery saw that something effectual must be done to put a check upon this increase, or the whole system would inevitably fall. They began to plot and contrive with all the ardor and cunning of men who felt that their all was at stake. The plan of colonizing the free people of color on the coast of Africa was the only one that commended itself to their adoption; and for sixteen years, the legislature of Virginia were in secret session at various times, endeavoring to perfect it. From that time the doctrine began every where to be preached, that free blacks were a greater nuisance than even the slaves; that the condition of the slaves was far superior to their own; that they were the most degraded, the most abandoned race on the earth; that they must be the subjects of a degraded and inferior race, 'repugnant to our republican feelings, and dangerous to our republican institutions,' owing to causes beyond the control of the human will—to an ordination of Providence, unchangeable as the laws of Nature; that they could not be incorporated as a people, and remain among us; that it would be as humane to throw them into the ocean, as to set them free in this country; that by their removal, the slaves would be more industrious and attentive to the commands of their masters, and that the source of danger be closed,—and permanency be given to the system of slavery; that the rights of slaveholders ought to remain sacred; that policy, and even the voice of humanity, forbade the progress of manumission; and that the plan of colonization was a sufficient justification for the continuance of slavery. To carry these doctrines into effect, and to give them currency, the American Colonization Society was formed; and on almost every page of its organ, the African Repository, they have recorded the plausible phraseology of the above synopsis. The plain and indisputable result is, that there are now *several hundred thousand slaves more then there were at the formation of the society*; that in nearly every slaveholding State, there have been several instances of emancipation upon the soil; that great perseculions have arisen against the free colored population all over the country; and that a complete check has been given to the spirit of abolition.

JOURNAL OF FREEDOM.

This is the impudent title of a new pro-slavery paper which is published weekly in New-Haven. It professes to be conducted by '*a association of gentlemen*'—*for gentlemen, and blackguards.* Of course, it is strongly in favor of banishing the colored population of the United States to the coast of Africa. These '*gentlemen*' are too nice and too genteel to live in the same country with 'niggers.' We commend their paper to the patronage of all southern slaveholders and their numerous adherents throughout the Union.

☞ The following is a letter addressed to ARNOLD BUFFUM by the Rev. JOHN SCOBLE, of London.

LONDON, June 6, 1834.

ARNOLD BUFFUM, Esq.

Dear Sir—Your labors in the cause of Justice, Humanity, and Religion, have long since recommended you to the warm affection of your brother abolitionists in this country. I could not, therefore, lose the present opportunity of opening a correspondence with you, and forwarding a few papers issued by our new Society for 'the universal abolition of negro slavery and the slave trade.'

The Declaration of the National Anti-Slavery Convention is a truly eloquent, powerful and christian production—and the truths which it contains will, I doubt not, be responded to by our American brethren generally. I cannot believe that a people, republican in their principles, and christian in their professions, will long withhold the blessings of liberty from those they have hitherto degraded and enslaved, or equal civil and religious rights from those who have hitherto been the victims of their absurd and unchristian prejudices. On this side the Atlantic, we are at a loss to account for the inconsistency, tyranny and cruelty of our American brethren! The American Colonization Society—has it received its death blow? or will it still linger on in the feeble existence? It is humiliating a spectacle to behold men of influence, talents and piety, compromising their principles and characters in the support of such an Institution!

Our talented and beloved friend GEORGE THOMPSON will soon be among you. His energy, his noble principles, his commanding eloquence, his generous disposition, his unaffected manners, will soon recommend him to you all. Give him a clear stage, and he will ask no favor! Let his opponents meet him openly and fairly, and I fear not the issue. Be it known, his mission is not a political one. He will visit you in the spirit of peace and love to enunciate and defend those great principles, which will, I trust, receive a triumphant issue in this country, viz. *That man cannot hold property in man*—that slavery is a crime before God, and must therefore be abolished. As you have opportunity, we trust you will forward us all the information you can collect, and which it may be important to communicate.

I need not say, with what intense interest we shall mark your progress, and how ready we shall be, at all times, to assist you in your work of love.

May that divine providence, who has all events at his disposal, direct your counsels, and crown your efforts with speedy and complete success!

I am, my dear Sir,
Yours sincerely,
JOHN SCOBLE, *Secretary.*

ARRIVAL OF GEORGE THOMPSON, ESQ.

With emotions of gratitude and joy too strong for utterance, we inform our readers that this distinguished philanthropist and most eloquent orator arrived in the ship Champlain, at New-York, on Saturday last. For several days previous, we read the New-York Courier & Enquirer, true to its own infamous character, published several libellous and incendiary articles against Mr. Thompson, evidently for the purpose of stirring up another mob in that city. We think to learn, yesterday, from the exciting statement of the outrage in Stone's Commercial Advertiser, Mr. T. has already encountered some hostility in the Atlantic hotel, in which he had taken lodgings with his infirmating family. Will may the enemies of liberty tremble in view of his contemplated labors in this country! The friends of emancipation will give him a cordial welcome, and bless God for his safe arrival on our shores.

A MERITED TRIBUTE.

☞ The following inscription, from the eloquent and vigorous pen of DAVID L. CHILD, Esq. of this city, is to be put upon the tomb of JOHN KENRICK, late of Newton, the first President of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society. The tribute is most justly bestowed.

JOHN KENRICK, ESQ.
AGED 77 YEARS.

He was laborious, honest and frugal.
Though possessed of wealth,
He loved not money, but loved his fellow men:
Rigidly sparing in self-indulgence, but bountiful to others.
He was a benefactor to the needy and unfortunate;
To the funds for the poor of this his native town,
And to benevolent societies and Christian charities every where.
To the temperance reformation he was an efficient and devoted friend.
Early impressed with the unlawfulness, impiety and inhumanity of Slavery,
And its peculiar incompatibility with republican government,
He strove long and constantly to awaken his countrymen to the subject:
He wrote often and persuasively for the press;
He republished gratuitously the writings of others;
And if there had been 'ten' like him in these States,
The stain of slavery would not have darkened another Star.
In the North American Constellation.
A forerunner of Abolition, he was a liberal contributor
To the first Society formed for that object in our country,
And died its presiding officer.
He believed that goodness consists in doing good,
And that the truest homage to Almighty God
Is a reverent imitation of his benevolent works.
He was born March 6, 1755,
And died March 28, 1833.
His grateful children have placed this marble over his remains.

THE WEST INDIES.

Almost two months have transpired since the slaves in the British Colonies were emancipated, and no intelligence has been received of the murder of a single planter, of the burning of a single dwelling, or the plundering of a single store. On the contrary, every thing remains quiet, and the abolition act is in the full tide of successful experiment. How affecting must be these tidings to the alarmists in this country, who have been dwelling so long, so pathetically, and so oracularly upon the terrible consequences that must result from immediate emancipation!

☞ The Postmaster at Georgetown, S. C. states that the loss of property sustained by the last tornado in that place 'will not falls short of 200,000, one-fourth of the rice crops.' Add to this the loss which must have occurred from the recent fresh, the destruction of property by incendiaries.

A Mob at Trenton.—The spirit of mobocracy still continues to work. On Sunday night a number of persons collected around the colored Methodist church of that place, and after a few yells and whoops demolished the windows—crossing great alarm among the congregation, who fled in terror; when the rioters, following their example, also ran away and escaped.—*N. Y. Transcript.*

DESTRUCTIVE FIRE—WALL-STREET CHURCH BURNT.

About half-past 5 o'clock on Saturday afternoon, the elegant church in Wall-street, known as the First Presbyterian church, was discovered to be on fire, between the ceiling and the roof, as indicated by smoke issuing through the fissures of the latter. The moment the alarm was given, we hastened to the residence of a friend, which overlooks and nearly adjoins the church, and from the upper windows had a perfect view of the conflagration, which was at once awful and magnificent. When we reached the place of observation, the flame was streaming through the roof, a little to the East of the ridge, and about two thirds the distance from the steeple to the rear of the building. For a considerable extent in every direction from this flame, smoke was pressing upwards through the shingles, and ere long the whole body of the roof was a mass of living fire, sending forth such volumes of flames as we scarcely ever witnessed, although we have been present at nearly every conflagration which has occurred in this city for the last six years. The conspicuity of the flames had attracted vast multitudes to the spot, and by this time several thousand persons were present, gazing with intense interest upon the spectacle before them. The fire now ascended the steeple, both from within and from without, the bell in the mean time being rung till the rope burnt off, and portions of the roof successively falling in, and passing through the ceiling into the body of the church. We must leave the imagination of the reader to picture the scene at this moment—for language fails us. The fire was burned with more fury even than the roof. At length the bell, that had so faithfully sounded the alarm on this and on other occasions, fell a victim to its own steadfastness, and down it tumbled, through what was not how many floors, till it found a resting-place. The top of the cupola, which was of course last to take fire, remained but partially burnt when the timbers that supported it gave way, and down it came with a heavy crash into the body of the church. In the sequel, every part of the building that was combustible, was destroyed, and the amount of timber and other wood-work employed for this purpose, in the construction of the walls stand firm, being nearly or quite two feet thick, and also the stone-work of the tower, extending to the height of perhaps 60 feet. The dimensions of the building were 97 feet by 68. It was erected in 1810, on the site of a former edifice occupied by the same society, which was founded in 1719, and enlarged in 1748. The present structure was built of brown stone, the front being ornamented with pillars of the same material, in demi-relief, with Corinthian capitals. The spire was ornamented with pillars to correspond. The whole cost of the building was $47,000. The insurance is $20,000, which is divided equally between two offices in Wall-street.

Most of the furniture was saved, such as chandeliers, cushions, and books; particularly the pulpit Bible and Psalm Book, which, we understand, is highly valued for their years as well as their contents, having been used in the same pulpit, or its predecessor, as long ago as the days of the Rev. Dr. Rogers, whose memory is held in universal estimation. Rev. Dr. Phillips is present pastor.

In regard to the origin of this fire, all we can say is, that it is perfectly unaccountable unless it was the work of an incendiary. We learn from the sexton that there had been no fire carried into the building to his knowledge, for more than two months. The place where the fire originated was extremely difficult of access, and could only be reached by going through a narrow trap door, across passages, and then ascending to the proper height in the tower. The outer door of the church (which opens into the tower) was left unlocked by the sexton on Saturday afternoon, (as usual on Saturday afternoon,) he being engaged within, in dusting the seats and attending to other business in the line of his profession.

Several of the surrounding buildings were excessively heated, and some of them occasionally on fire; but being mostly fire-proof, and the engines playing upon them at intervals, the damage was almost wholly confined to the church.—*Jour. of Com.*

MADRID RIOTS.

The correspondent of the London Morning Herald at Madrid gives the following scenes:

'Among the persons (Jesuits from the church of San Isidro) who tried to escape in colored clothes, was one who, the moment he came into the street, startled with fear on seeing such a force, ran with all his might. This attracted the attention of one of the mounted Urbanos, who challenged the man still ran the faster, but the horseman came up with him at the end of the street, and as his hat fell off, betraying the shaven crown, the Urbano calling out, 'the poisoning Jesuit!' cut him down. The horse alarmed threw his rider, who was severely hurt by the fall, and there lay the corpse and the slayer, until the latter was assisted to a surgeon, while the other received every kindness and comfort could be offered to it. Three other Jesuits who attempted escape, shared the same fate; and a friend of mine saw the people hauling their bodies about, and plunging swords into them at every pause. Blood being now shed, the mob rushed into the building, and as they crossed the inner square, it is stated that the Jesuits fired upon them from above. I have no means of contradicting this story, as my witnesses were all outside the doors, and none but those who were engaged in the subsequent acts, and whose testimony must, of necessity, be subject to doubt, can furnish evidence upon the point. The result, however, was that 15 unfortunate friars were hunted from cell to cell, and killed. Here the people say, justly and lawfully killed. Shall I say murdered?

The mob still unsatisfied, proposed to attack the convent of San Francisco el Grande, in the street of the same name, and a numerous body of them directed themselves towards it. The friars advised of what was going on in other places, barricaded their gates, and as the mob approached, one of them ran up to the belfry, and began to toll the alarm bell. This enraged the crowd, as it was supposed to be a signal to the Carlists to rise in favor of the monks, and one of the Urbanos levelling his piece shot the friar in the hand with which he was pulling the rope. His companions then attacked the gates with bars and hatchets, and soon making an entrance, drove the inmates from cell to cell, and killed 15 or 16 of them. It is said that in one of the cells was found a man who had been three years a prisoner, and this circumstance added so much fuel to their fury, that not a friar that could be laid hold of was suffered to escape. Another mob had in the mean time rushed to the convent of La Merced, and there similar barbarity was repeated.

REPORT OF CONVENTION.

The members of the N. E. A. S. Convention, held in this city in May last, are informed that the Report of the Proceedings is published, and will be delivered to them on application to Mr. B. C. Bacon at the Anti-Slavery Office, No. 46, Washington-Street.

In giving this notice, the Secretaries feel it their duty to state that in consequence of the small amount of money received at the convention, there was but little left after paying the ordinary expenses. As they did not at liberty on that account to withhold so important a document, the only alternative left the Publishing Committee was to publish the Report, with the expectation that the several Anti-Slavery Societies in New-England would be willing to take at cost, a number of copies proportioned to their means of paying for and distributing them, and that the remainder might be sold to others at a trifling advance from the cost. The work contains 72 large octavo pages, closely printed, and will be put at the low price of $10 per hundred, $1,50 per dozen, and 18 3-4 cents single.

With this statement the Secretaries would earnestly request the several Anti-Slavery Societies in New-England, and Delegates of the Convention, to forward their orders to Mr. Bacon as above.

JOHN M. S. PERRY, Mendon, Ms. } *Secs. of*
BENJ. C. BACON, Boston, } *Conven.*
Sept. 20.

NOTICE.

The subscribers take the liberty to invite the friends of the immediate abolition of Slavery, residing in Middlesex County, to meet in Convention at Groton, on Wednesday, the first day of October next, to consider the expediency of forming a Middlesex County Slavery Society, or to adopt any other measure for the removal of Slavery in the United States. The attendance of several well-known friends of the cause, from other parts of the country, is expected. Our fellow citizens generally are respectfully invited to attend the public exercises. The Convention will be formed at 10 o'clock, A. M.

W. L. Chaplin; Amos Farnsworth; Isaiah Cragin; Luther Boutteil; James T. Woodbury; Asa Rand; Giles Pease; William Twining.

Humorous Publication.—We have before us Reese's Review of the Anti-Slavery Society, 'Dissected by Martin Mar Quisck, M. D. L. L. D. M. Q. L. H. S. O. O. S. M. F. M. P. S. &c. &c. &c. Of that lik.'

Without entering at all into the merits of the arguments between the friends of immediate emancipation and their opponents, we must say that the pages to which we now refer, are written in a good humored, sprightly manner. We suspect, however, that this lively *dose* will hardly operate well on the distinguished Reviewer.—*Brooklyn (N. Y.) Advertiser.*

MR. ELLSWORTH'S ARGUMENT.

The Argument of this distinguished gentleman in the case of Miss Crandall occupies a large portion of our present number, as we have felt reluctant to divide it. It is very able, and will be read from beginning to end with unfaltering interest.

☞ The Chairman of the Committee, appointed by the late N. E. A. S. Convention to prepare an Address to the People of the United States, wishes to state, that the subsequent passage contained in the Address in the last number of the Liberator, and placed at the head of the heart-moving 'Stanzas by J. G. Whittier,' is from the pen of Miss Charles Stuart.

☞ The communication of 'Z.' in a preceding column, was written more than a year since, but was accidentally mislaid.

QUARTERLY MEETING.

☞ The Quarterly Meeting of the New-England Anti-Slavery Society will be held at the Society's Room, 46, Washington Street, on MONDAY AFTERNOON NEXT, at half past 3 o'clock. Addresses may be expected from several gentlemen.

LIST OF LETTERS received at this Office since our last paper.

Albert Lackey, Danvers, Mass.; Richard C. Johnson, New-Bedford, Mass.; J. V. Himes, Portsmouth, N. H.; Harris Foster, Hartford, Ct.; Thomas Whitson, Sadsbury, Pa.; F. Brindsley, Lowell, Mass.

DIED—In New-Bedford, suddenly, on the 14th inst. Mr. Jacob Sowle, aged 51 years, and for the last eighteen years a member of the Methodist Episcopal Society in that town.

WRITING

A WRITING SCHOOL will be opened in Belknap-street, for colored persons, as soon as a sufficient number may be obtained. All who wish to avail themselves of this opportunity, are invited to leave their names at this office. Sept. 13.

NOTICE.

WE invite the attention of the friends of the colored people to a benevolent institution, recently formed in this city, for the melioration of the sufferings of indigent children. The Boston Samaritan Asylum was organized in April last, and has now under its protection four colored children, whose parents are unable or unqualified to educate them. They are removed from their parents or relations, who resign all control over them, and are to remain in the Asylum that will enable them to procure a respectable maintenance. This Asylum is designed particularly, though not exclusively, for colored children. Many more children, suitable objects for the charity of such an institution, might be obtained, if its funds would permit; but these are so limited, that the future support of those already under its care is uncertain. But we believe that the friends of the orphan will not permit this institution to fall for want of their co-operation. Believing that it is worthy of their patronage, we solicit the liberal contribution of the benevolent in Boston and its vicinity.

☞ Those of our friends in adjacent towns, who are inclined to make donations to this *Asylum*, are requested to transmit them to Mr. William L. Garrison, or Samuel E. Sewall, Esq. of Boston.

MARY GREW, *Sec'y.*
Boston, Aug. 20, 1834.

BOY WANTED.

WANTED in a gentleman's family, an honest and capable colored boy from 11 to 13 years of age. None need apply but such as can be well recommended. Apply at No. 13, Brattle-street. Sept. 20.

the most abhorrent and licentious traffic the Colonization Society prolongs and extends. It is of no moment what is the color of the child which the selling woman's brings forth; it is a slave worth from two to three hundred dollars as soon as it opens its infant light. The following fact will illustrate this system; and Mr. Danforth with all his sophistications, and Mr. Finley by his mystifying, and the Editor of the Commercial with his insolent sneering, and the Methodist Reviewer with his impudence, and all the American legion of supporters of the hell of slavery; cannot controvert the FIRE-BRAND.'

Mr. Fitzhugh married a colored daughter of his slave. He educated her properly. At his death, long since, he bequeathed to her in consideration of her freedom an annual income, independent of all contingencies, to be supposed. About the time of his decease, she became pregnant by her own white brother, the acting executor of his last will, who destroyed the codicil of the will leaving his sister, and then sold her with his unborn child to the infamous man-traders in that city, to be shipped her to Georgia! That is a genuine fruit of American slavery, as it is daily practised from Baltimore to New-Orleans; and any man who talk about abolishing such a system gradually, or not religiously intended to be a fanatic, but who can say of the spirit of an incendiary to set society with the firebrands of hell. Away with such a generation of vipers!! Z.

THE TYRANNY OF FREEDOM.

'Twenty hundred girls, whose only offence consists in being the offspring of the community is, that they have met together *to obtain useful knowledge*, were driven out of their school rooms, because, forsooth, they feel that they and their duty dwell is not protected by the laws of this free country, THE OFFICERS OF the corporation of the peace, THE OFFICERS OF JUSTICE, is the expression in which it is situated. Such a tale almost blistered my lips. My heart burned with indignation. I felt ashamed of Canterbury, ashamed of Connecticut, ashamed of my country, ashamed *I. May's Letter to the Liberator.*

'In a land of liberty,—a government of law,—under a constitution guaranteeing equal rights, and conferring exclusive privileges,—in a State peculiarly designated among all the rest as 'the land of the pilgrims'—the founders of whose constitution declared God, in its Preamble, that its his' good assistance he had permitted them to enjoy a free government,'—in *Connecticut*, and bibles, schools, churches, and other moral and intellectual privileges—in the home of a *respectable woman* is at midnight assaulted and partially destroyed by a rabble mob, AND THE CIVIL AUTHORITIES ARE ABSENT, not moving a finger for the detection of the perpetrators of the outrage! Can it be believed!

The founds of good order at home,—the advocates of liberal principles in government abroad,—the good, the wise, the moral, the thoughtful, the tender, the pious, the wealthy, and the wise, of every where,—all, who have the common feelings of humanity,—who have hearts, sentiments, souls, to feel like men, like patriots, like christians, may well be discouraged now! The events of but four months prove, alas! too well, that our country is ruled by a power more deadly cruel than any tyranny that ever sat upon a bloody throne. It is a power more fearful than that of a Turkish sultan,—for the Turkish sultan has but one life to lay down at the command of an outraged people. It is a power more absolute than that of kings, monarchs and military chiefs, for these are tangible, perceptible, and easily reached. Ministries, parties, factions, clubs and sects, cannot wield such mighty power as this—for they comprise but detached portions of the lordly public. No! it is none of these that now powers and rules the destinies of our heaven-favored land:—it is the spirit of the people themselves,—the worst passions of man,—'the tender mercies of the wicked'—the fiery rage of the mob,—a tyranny more violent, more furious and fatal than that of an Attila, an Alaric, or a Napoleon. The touch of the Simoom is not more blasting,—the shadow of the Upas is not more withering,—the throes of the earth when convulsed by an earthquake are not more devastating,—lightning is not more sudden and quick, and fatal, than the breath, the motions, and the influences of a blindly raging mob. How dreadful are its slow influences increased, rendered more steady by its virtual encouragement, the silent, implacable permission of their continuance and operation, by those whose SOLEMN, SWORN, RELIGIOUS DUTY it is to check, to stay, to crush them!

Oh my country! Is all thy boasted liberty but fanciousness? Is the land, the blood of our fathers doomed to redeem from kingly despotism, destined to be governed by a tyranny a thousand times more cruel,—a million fold more deadly to our interests as men, as freemen, and as Christians?

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN.

IMMEDIATE EMANCIPATION.

MR. EDITOR,—It is notorious that the doctrine of immediate and universal emancipation as advocated by Abolitionists, is sternly repudiated—not merely by reckless and infuriated mobs, but by many well-intentioned and eminent philanthropists. Their adjudications in relation to the subject, appear, thus far, to have resulted in the entire conviction that it is dangerous to the community, and unproductive of benefit to the slaves;—that anarchy, insurrection, and numberless foul evils, both national and individual, will inevitably ensue, from the immediate adoption of such an innovation or change.

But, Mr. Editor, however pertinent the claims of such individuals to rectitude of intention, purity of motive, and general disinterestedness and benevolence of demeanor, if by no means necessarily relative, their eminents are peremptory, or their decisions final; or that they are the result of a laborious and accurate survey of the entire subject in all its length and breadth.

The assumption that such a catastrophe as a general and immediate will unavoidably result from the emancipation of the black, is obviously sophistical, baseless as it is utterly repugnant to the established philosophy of the human mind. Affection ordinarily begets its similitude; as also, its opposite inflames hatred and revenge. Have those indeed, who have rescued from the thraldom of perpetual oppression and slavery, evinced a disposition to injure their benefactors? Have they clandestinely resorted to slay with a ruthless assault those by whose efforts they have become freemen—their benighted souls enlightened and their prospects transformed established upon a broad and substantial basis? The very converse of all this obtains. They have evinced, to an equal extent with the white population, a spirit of unity christian regard and forbearance—a desire the deprivation of their just immunities and rights.

In relation to the assumption that emancipation is unproductive of benefit to the slaves, we are perplexed, that the gentlemen authorizing such a claim are utterly unknowable. What an illustrious commentary, forsooth, upon the spirit of republicanism, the genius of christianity, which pervade the breasts of the men of the nineteenth century, is the fact, that science, discovery and christian colonization are to be rejected, by a patriotic and christian community, from an invincible necessity, and their merits, thereby, rendered more abject and galling than the chains of the despot!

The mind of man, Mr. Editor, is never more delicate, nor less allured astray by the inhibition or admission of error; that is, when a sophistical theory begins to consecrate practice, and the fallacy of the theory is received by the supposed necessity of the practice. Errors in speculation induce errors in practice, and errors in practice sanction errors in speculation; and the mind is literally chained when it is informed by a fallacy of this nature.

These conventions should recommend themselves to all, who unfeignedly desire the happiness of their species. We ordinarily reason from facts or from certain established principles; and we deem the last reasoning conclusive. Facts indeed—unperverted—can never delude or lead as astray. But man, not unfrequently, assumes principles as authentic or true, which are not merely erroneous, but highly absurd and destructive in their practical application; and not infrequently too, through the influence of prejudice or prepossession, distorts the obvious import of facts, to subserve his own peculiar and selfish purposes. In relation to the principles of natural science, they are founded upon the immutable rock—or in other words, seem altogether beyond the reach of scepticism. But in relation to fallible and variable human nature, the principles which confirm an error may be the effect of a preexisting error; and if they should oppose the onward strides of benevolent improvement, ought we not to institute a new order of principles, which will conform more accurately to the dictates of an enlightened reason, and the genius of divine truth?

It is this inhibition or involution of error which has intercepted the march of female improvement—which so long ratified the usage of that base of moral corruption—alcohol; in fine, by virtue of its potent influence, the congregated evils which have stigmatized the page of our history, have been sustained and multiplied. And shall it be deemed arrogant to aver, distinctly, in this connexion, that this reasoning from assumed principles, or under the influence of prejudice or prepossession, is the secret barrier, that resists the progress of universal emancipation?

If the assumptions we have briefly alluded to constitute the more prominent objections, we hazard nothing in affirming, that the entire scheme of opposition is founded in great palpable error. For as before remarked, the event of insurrection is utterly repugnant to the established philosophy of the human mind; and the common sense of man, and the voice of stubborn facts, strongly repudiate such gratuitous fabrications as a general chaos, and detriment to the enslaved.

A CONSTANT READER.

North Berwick, Me. Sept. 17, 1834.

CLASS BOOK OF ANATOMY.

MR. EDITOR:—The following passage occurs in Dr. Smith's Anatomical Class Book, pa ge 61, and is, I conceive, a libel on that class of persons to whom it is intended to apply. What colored teacher will place such a book as this in the hands of his pupil, which tells him, 'that the negro and mulatto have majestic countenances, expressive of thought, portrayed in his features,' and 'that the pictures of colored persons are always very nearly alike; the portrait of one indeed, will answer for many, &c. &c.!' Such language could only proceed from the inventor of the 'race, and not from the benevolent designs of communicating the principles of true anatomical knowledge. That the charge is false and libellous, must be evident to every reflecting mind.

Yours, MEDICUS.

[*From Dr. J. V. C. Smith's Class Book of Anatomy.*] 'Of the negro, owing partly to the color of the skin, the expression is necessarily very imperfect:—he can never have majesty nor dignity, or an elevation of thought, portrayed in his features (!) when the jet black negro expresses his emotions, unless the teeth and the whites of the eye are exposed;—there is little variety of expression, but many shades are created by the contraction of the muscles. This fact is familiar to artists,—to the organ and the painter. The pictures of colored persons are always very nearly alike; the portrait of one, indeed, will answer for many.—(!) and the circumstance is wholly referable to the *imperfect* manner in which the light and shadow are produced on the skin.'

In the next paragraph, as if to justify and apologize for his base libel on the colored race, he says 'the energies of expression are fewer and smaller, as animals descend the scale of creation.' So then the blacks are one scale below the *human* race, therefore 'their expression is necessarily very imperfect!' This appears to be his logical inference on page of being drawn from his language.

When the Dr. shall have laid aside a few of his prejudices, and have studied to give a true representation of the human race, we may feel a little more inclined to recommend his books to the public, and *especially to the colored race.*

TORONTO, Upper Canada, (originally called York,) Sept. 4, 1834.

MR. GARRISON,

Kind Sir—I must beg to solicit your favor to insert this notice in the Liberator, for the information of my friends and acquaintances in Philadelphia. Having reached the soil of Great Britain in America, and finding the laws, government, and people, so different from those of the United States, I have relinquished all desire of returning, and am sorry I did not, long before this period, number myself with the illustrious sons of Great Britain. No people are known here by their color. This place contains about two hundred and fifty colored emigrants from different parts of the United States, who are doing very well. It is supposed all Canada contains about seven thousand colored inhabitants. The king of Great Britain has more loyal and loyal subjects in any part of his dominion—that I can safely say. They would die by the weapon of war to support the country that gives liberty and equality to all subjects alike. This is the only country I know of. I would counsel my colored citizens of the United States to transplant themselves, if they have a desire to move. No place is more suitable for the acquisition of wealth and respectability.

WESTERN GRAVES, *late of Philadelphia.*

NO DISCUSSION!

Certain of the students of a certain Seminary in Vermont, not many weeks since, consulted one of the instructors with regard to the expediency of forming a Colonization Society among the students. His advice was, not to undertake it—alleging as a reason, that it would lead to discussion, and he had noticed that discussion of the subject had pretty uniformly resulted in a going over to the wrong side! O. S. M.

[From the Journal of Commerce.]

LONDON, Aug. 4th, 1834.

'Connected with the subject of negro emancipation, I may as well observe that the first of August has been held as quite a feste day, both in the West Indies and the country. Most of the religious congregations devoted the whole day to prayer, and those among the admirers of this great and glorious act, whose religious feelings were not so predominant, spent the day, as I have said, in joy and festivity. Several noblemen and gentlemen dined together, and Lord Mulgrave, the late Governor of Jamaica, presided. Several negroes were invited to dinner, and were mingled with the distinguished company, in the most perfect fellowship. One of them addressed the meeting in a strain of the most powerful eloquence, and received the hearty congratulations of the noble chairman. These negroes were quite strangers in the company, but knowing that if they paid their guinea for a ticket, they had as much right there as the first noble in the land, they did so, and were kindly treated. This would never be tolerated in the United States. Time will, perhaps, do wonders even among the bitterest foes of the colored race, and before long induce them to exclaim: 'Britannia has triumphed—the negro is free.'

☞ It really seems, from the above account, that the aristocrats of England are much more *republican* in their feelings than the vaunting democrats of the U. States.

LITERARY.

[For the Liberator.]

ADDRESS TO SPRING.

By a colored girl of ten years of age.

Welcome, welcome, lovely Spring,
Come and spend my months with me;
I bell thee as my verdant queen
Thou shall see how kind I'll be.

Then when pretty Spring is gone,
And three seasons are come and past,
Till thou com'st again I 'll mourn—
We will meet again at last.

Welcome, welcome, lovely Spring,
Come and spend thy months with me;
Still I'll bail thee as my queen,
Still I'll be the same to thee.

M. W. D.

The two following delightful poems, by Miss Mary Ann Browne, are natural and touching:

MAN'S LOVE.

When woman's eye grows dull,
And her cheek paleth,
When fades the beautiful,
Then man's love faileth;
He sits not beside her chair,
Clasps not her fingers,
Twines not the damp hair
That o'er her brow lingers.

He comes but a moment in,
Though her eye lightens,
Though his soul pants, and thin,
Feverishly brightens;
He stays but a moment near
When that flush fadeth,
Though true affection's tear
Her soil eyelid shadeth.

He goes from her chamber straight
Into life's jostle,
He meets at the very gate
Business and bustle;
He thinks not of her within,
Slightly sighing,
He forgets in that noisy din
That she is dying!

And when her young heart is still,
What thought he mourneth?
Soon from his sorrow chill
Wearied he turneth.
Soon o'er her buried head
Memory's light stream,
And the true-hearted dead
Thus man forgetteth!"

WOMAN'S LOVE.

When man is youthful fair,
And his hand is thin and weak,
And his lips are parched and pale,
And wan and white his cheek;
Oh, then, doth woman prove
Her constancy and love!

She sitteth by his chair,
And holds his feeble hand;
She watcheth ever there,
His wants to understand;
Yet unspoken will
She anticipateth to fulfil.

She leads him, — when the moon
Is bright o'er dale or hill,
And all things, save the tune
Of the honey bees, are still, —
Into the garden bowers,
To sit 'midst herbs and flowers.

And when he goes not there,
To feast on breath and bloom,
She brings the posy rare
Into his darkened room;
And 'neath his weary head
The pillow smooth doth spread.

Until the hour, when death
His lamp of life doth dim,
She never weareth,
She never leaveth him;
Still near him night and day,
She meets his eye alway.

And when his trial 's o'er,
And the turf is on his breast,
Deep in her bosom's core
Life sorrows unexpressed;
Her tears, her sighs, are weak,
Her settled grief to speak.

And though there may arise
Balm for her spirit's pain,
And though her quiet eyes
May sometimes smile again;
Still, still, she must regret,
She never can forget!

Every one acquainted with the magic-like influence that has converted Lowell from a wilderness to one of the most flourishing manufacturing towns in the world, will be pleased with the following:

[From the Lowell Mercury.]

LOWELL.

I sat on the banks of the Merrimack,
When the sun went down for a night's repose,
The stars came out and the clouds flew back,
And the moon looked down from the burnished sky,
And the meteor shone, and the lantern-fly,
And the nightingale's song on the hill arose.

The soft breezes fanned, and the gentle gale
Had ceased its play by the river's side;
And a murmur passed through the winding vale,
Like the ocean's moan when the storm is o'er,
And the sea-birds flock to the wave-worn shore,
And the white sails roam on the trackless tide.

But Lowell arose with its many spires,
With its house of brick, and its church of stone,
And the eagle forsook his former eyries;
For the fact'ries rose, and were heard afar
The picker's lodd hum and the quick loom's jar,
And the bell that hung in the bleach-house done.

The forest bowed low, and the beasts forsook
Their long quiet home for a distant wood,
And the otter sought for another brook;
For a town was there in its costly pride,
And the wagons passed where the streets were wide,
And the river roared where the stone-dam stood.

The red thunder spoke with a startling shock,
And echo answered from the distant blue
To the hollow sound of the shattered rock:
The valleys were rained and the hills made low,
By the mountain's drill and the hammer's blow,
And the steam-draw cars on the rail-road flew.

And a few years passed, and the forest dark
Was turned to a full business city quite;
And the nightingale's song and the note of the lark
Were heard no more — nor the beautiful sound
That sung in the grass of the meadow ground;
And the pale lamp lighted the lonesome night.

LA VISTA.

MEMORY.

What is memory?
As echo — time, the passing sound —
A mirror — its bright surface shows
Hope, grief, and love, delight, regret;—
As ark on time's bereaving sea;—
A perfume from a flower decayed;
A splendid mine is memory.

PROTECTION.

Reposing on thy heart,
I hear the blasts of fortune sweeping by,
As a babe lies to music — wondering, but
Not affrighted.

MISCELLANEOUS.

THOMAS JENKINS,

A SELF-TAUGHT COLORED MAN.

Thomas Jenkins was the son of an African king on the coast of Guinea, who took it into his head to send his son to England for his education. The British captain, to whom the king consigned him, and who gave him the name of Thomas Jenkins, died soon after he returned home, and Jenkins was thus thrown destitute upon the world. A farmer who was a very distant relative of the captain, at length took him home with him, and employed him in rocking the cradle, looking after the poultry, pigs, &c. He was successively advanced to the offices of cow-herd and teamster. When he went to live with the farmer, he could hardly understand a word of English, but he very soon acquired a good knowledge of the common relect.

After he became 'a stout boy,' he was transferred to another gentleman, where he became a sort of Jack-of-all-trades. He was cow-herd, stable boy, errand boy, or any thing else convenient. He was soon found to have a taste for learning, and to have actually made some progress. How he acquired his first lessons, nobody ever knew. Perhaps it was through the medium of the servants. The lady of the house was soon surprised to find he had a strange fondness for candle ends. Every scrap of wick and tallow that he fell in with, was secreted and taken away to his loft, over the stable; and unpleasant suspicions began to be entertained of him. On watching him, at one time, after he had retired to his den, it was found, to the great astonishment of all, that he was engaged with a book and a slate, in making rude imitations of the letters of the alphabet. It was also found that he kept an old fiddle by him; and that it cost the horses many sleepless nights.

His master now put him to an evening school, where he made such progress as astonished all who knew it; and though constantly occupied still, during the day, he soon began to *instruct himself in Latin and Greek.* A boy in the neighborhood had many books; and the family and others favored him. Without the means of any regular instruction, he soon gained a tolerable knowledge of Latin and Greek, and began the study of Mathematics.

His eye now turned toward a dictionary; and going one night to an auction, he (with the assistance of another boy, and about a shilling from a gentleman who stood by,) bid off one.

When he was twenty years of age, a vacancy occurring in a small parish school, among other candidates for the office, Jenkins, with a heap of books under his arm, made his appearance. The committee were surprised, but on examining him, and the testimonials of character he brought, his knowledge was found so thorough, and his morals so correct, that he was unanimously preference to the other candidates. The Presbytery, however, in prejudice voted him out again; but the circumstance produced so much excitement that an opposition school was soon got up, and Jenkins was placed at the head of it.

The result was most happy. In his method of communicating knowledge and of governing his school he was excellent; and he was beloved by all his pupils. No teacher ever possessed a kinder disposition or better temper. Five days of every week were spent in the school, and the sixth he occupied in walking four or five miles, and reciting his week's lessons to another teacher.

By conducting the school one or two years, he was able to save nearly a hundred dollars. Now it was that he began to think of spending a winter at the college. Many were surprised at this, and among the rest the professors, most of whom generously relinquished their fees. One gentleman, perceiving what the bent of his mind was, gave him a draft upon a merchant in the city for whatever money he wanted. Having spent the winter in Edinburgh, he returned once more to his professional duties.

The sequel of his history is not very well known. It appears, however, that he was deputed by the Society for promoting Christian Knowledge, as a missionary to Mauritius, and that he still resides there. He entered this field of labor about ten years ago. It were greatly to be wished he had been restored to his native country, were his influence in civilizing and instructing his fellow men would probably have been much greater than in Mauritius.—*People's Magazine.*

A LOCK OF HAIR.

Few things in this weary world are so delightful as keepsakes. They do life's ever, to my heart at least, not to my eye, lose their tender, their powerful charms! How slight, how small, how tiny a memorial, saves a loved one from oblivion;—worn on the finger; or close to the heart, especially if they be dead. No thought is so insupportable as that of entire, total, blank forgetfulness—when the creature that once laughed and sung, and wept in us close to our side, or in our arms, is as if her smiles, her voice, her tears, her kisses had never been. She and them all swallowed up in the nothingness of dust.

Of all keepsakes, memorials, relics—most dearly, most devotedly do I love a little lock of hair; and oh! when the head is beautiful has long mouldered in the dust, how spiritual seems the undying glossiness of the sole remaining relic. All else gone to nothing, save and except that soft, smooth, burnished and glorious fragment of life sparkling then once hung in the clouds and sunshine over an angel's brow.

Aye, a lock of hair is far better than any picture—it is part of the beloved object herself; it belongs to the tresses that often, long ago, may have been dishevelled, like a shower of sunbeams, over your beating breast! But now solemn thoughts sadden the beauty once so bright—so refulgent! the longer you gaze on it, the more and more it seems to say, almost upbraidingly "wept thou no more for me?" and, indeed, a true tear to the imperishable affections in which all nature seemed to rejoice, bears witness, that the object for which it yearned is far more forgotten, now that she has been dead for so many long days, months, years; that she was forgotten, during an hour of absence that came like a passing sound between us and the sunshine of our living—her loving smiles.

Intelligence from Capt. Back.—We are happy to state that letters have been received from this gentleman, dated Fort Reliance, east end of Great Slave Lake, up to the 4th May last, when he was preparing to be off to prosecute the interior objects of the expedition. The packet from London, intituling Capt. Ross and party's safe return, which was forwarded from Montreal last November, reached Capt. Back on the 25th April.

The following description of a school clock, given by the Philadelphia Intelligencer, is indeed a curiosity:

In the Ladies Institute of this city, conducted by the Rev. R. W. Cushman, in Arch street, there is a clock, which, for the ingenious round of duty that it is made to perform, will compare with any curiosity of the present day. By an invention of Mr. Cushman, this clock is made to ring a bell, calling the school together in the morning, and when they are assembled, it proceeds then with the word 'study,' on the upper part of the dial. When the morning is half over, the bell strikes again, and the word 'recess,' takes the place of 'study.' By a vote of the scholars, it was decided that not a whisper should be made in school hours, except during this recess. While that word presents itself, for three minutes only, the school is in a buzz; when it has done, silence returns, implicit obedience follows. Several other words are presented by the same arrangement and the effect is admirable. Its advantages are seen in the perfect order that remains in the Institute.

Disorderly Conduct at Taunton.—It was resolved in Town Meeting at Taunton a short time since, that no person should be allowed to retail spirituous liquors there. Some persons, however, did retain it privately, and were detected and punished by fine.

We learn from Taunton that on Friday morning the doors of the houses and shops, the fruit and ornamental trees, &c., of the persons who were supposed to have been active in prosecuting them, were found to have been *tarred and feathered*, and other excesses committed.

These circumstances had created great excitement, and a town meeting had been called to prevent their repetition, and preserve the peace of the town.—*Transcript.*

Another Riot.—We understand that a small house in this city was torn down last Sunday night. It was occupied by a black family, by what means had incurred the displeasure of the *mobocracy* of this our little community.

If there be any thing worthy the indignation of good citizens, it is the perpetration of such deeds at a time like the present. We care not what the provocation may have been, the law is alone to revenge it.—*Detroit Courier.*

The Very Last Resort.—An Irishman was driving through Exchange street to-day, in a dirt cart, accompanied by a five gallon demijohn of port wine. The cart rattled on as dirt carts usually do when empty—jolt! jolt! jolt! The demijohn, as demijohns usually do under such circumstances, kept jumping up and down, and refused to stand still, any how the driver could fix it. He placed it in one position and then another—shoved it from side to side, and corner to corner, until his patience was entirely exhausted, and his temper got the whip in hand, when he dropt the reins, and seizing the demijohn with both hands, dashed it on the pavement, when it 'burst asunder in the midst,' and all its contents gushed out, to the astonishment of the boys and the relief of the perplexed driver, who, in the fulness of his joy, exclaimed as he gazed at the ruins, 'You are still enough now!'—*Transcript.*

Abolition of Slavery in Massachusetts.—In 1645, (only 15 years after the settlement of Boston) the public sentiment in Massachusetts was so strong against the slave trade and all slavery, that the General Court ordered a negro who had been brought within their jurisdiction by a slave captain, *to be carried back to Guinea*, and soon after passed laws prohibiting the buying and selling of slaves, and punished men-stealers with death. The honor of being the first government in christendom to abolish slavery belongs, therefore, to Massachusetts in the days of her primitive simplicity and integrity.

Great Castings.—The New York Screw Dock Company have just imported a pair of hydraulic presses, to be used in raising ships of a large class. The castings of these presses are enormous. The Journal of Commerce says the cylinders weigh sixteen tons each, and measure about seventeen feet in length, and nearly three feet in diameter. The original cost was £15 or $70 a ton: the freight in the Liverpool packet ship George Washington, was £150 sterling, or $700: the duty $800, and the expense of landing them from the ship $200. After all, the gross cost is but about five cents a pound. We presume that so large castings as these have never been attempted in this country. The founder in England stated that it had occupied forty men two days to move them from one side of the shop to the other.

A servant girl a few days since, on leaving her place, was accosted by her master as to her reason for leaving; the girl replied, 'Mistress is so quick tempered that I cannot live with her;' 'Why,' said he, 'you know that it is no sooner begun, than it is over!' 'Yes, sir,' said she, 'and no sooner over than begun again.'

Sixty years ago a pound of cotton could only be extended on a thread of 17,000 yards (not quite ten miles,) and this by close application of a man for a whole day. But by steam power, a pound of fine cotton can now be extended into a thread one hundred and sixty-seven miles long, and that with the attenuance of a mere child.

The Dog Population of the United States is estimated at one million and three hundred thousand, and the expense of keeping them upwards of ten millions of dollars annually.

A Good Example.—There is a long communication in the New-Hampshire Patriot, from 'the Trustees in behalf of the United Society, called Shakers, in Enfield, Merrimack County, N. H.,' respectfully requesting the public not to intrude any longer on their sanctuary devotions. Such a request should be respected by every other congregations, whether a certain class of the community crowd, as if they were going to plays.

Fatal Accident.—On Friday afternoon last, a fatal accident occurred in the western part of this city. A boy between eight and ten years of age was entrusted with a loaded gun, for the purpose of conveying it home. He proceeded in the street, pointing it at different children, when at length he presented it at a little boy about sixteen, which it was discharged, and the contents lodged in the youth's head. He died about ten the same evening.—*Cincin. Gaz.*

The Leesburg (Va.) Genius of Liberty says — We understand that, by a supervision in the will of the late Johnson Cleveland, Esq. of this County, the freedom of his slaves is placed at their option, conditioned on their removing to Liberia. In the event of their declining the liberal offer, they are to select their own master from among the relatives of the testator, and have two years allowed for a choice of destiny.

Fatal result of Sabbath breaking.—The Chambersburg (M. D.) Repository mentions a fatal occurrence which happened near Loudon, on Sabbath breaking, which likely took place near Loudoun in that County.—A man named Samuel Mundis and his son, a youth of about 16 years of age, on Sunday took to shoot a squirrel from a tree, situated near a church, during the time of divine worship. After a few shots had been discharged, the squirrel fell, when Mundis swore a horrible oath that he would have it, and accended the tree to accomplish his object—from which he soon again fell, or was shot! On examination, it was found that his skull was broken, and that he had a deep wound in his side. He was buried without the formality of an inquest.

A Turtle has been taken on the eastern shore of Maryland, weighing 1500 lbs.

MORAL.

[From the New-England Telegraph.]

THE DUTY OF SUBMITTING TO HUMAN LAWS.

A SERMON,
PREACHED IN THE FOURTH CHURCH, NEWARK, N. J., SABBATH EVENING, AUG. 3, 1834
BY WILLIAM R. WEBB,
PASTOR OF SAID CHURCH.

'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake.'—[1 Pet. 2. 13.

It has been sometimes asserted, that the Bible is in favor of despotic government; and the *divine right of kings* has been thought to derive support from its precepts. Yet, it has been a well known fact, that those who have construed the Bible most strictly, and have been distinguished for their rigid adherence to its doctrines, have been the most strenuous asserters of the rights of man, and the most unwavering supporters of free government. The sternest republicans the world ever saw were the Puritans. But it was their attachment to the Bible, and their disposition to conform strictly to its decisions, which, more than every thing else, exposed them to ridicule, to hatred, and to persecution. This well known fact would seem to prove, that the principles of the Bible must be favorable to civil liberty and the rights of man. And then, if we look at those principles themselves, our conclusion receives the strongest confirmation. The sum of all the Bible teaches respecting our duty to our fellow men, is contained in the golden rule, 'whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them;' for this is the law and the prophets.' Nothing could more completely shut out all injustice, and fraud, and oppression, and every species of tyranny; and require perfect equality among men. For, who would be willing to change places with the victim of his injustice, and receive from him the same oppression he now exercises? Or, who that now restrains others in the exercise of their rights, would himself choose to be abridged in the exercise of *his?* If this single precept contained the sum of all the precepts of the Bible, which relate to our duty to our fellow men; then it is plain, that the precepts and doctrines of the Bible, if carried out into practice, would secure to every man the full enjoyment of civil and religious liberty.

Yet, though the Bible is thus favorable to free government, it is undeniable that it was written chiefly by men living under a despotic government, and that it contains often reference to the unjust and oppressive laws which were then in force. The New Testament, especially was written by those who were under the authority of the Roman Emperors, and those as bad as the Nero Nero, whose very name conveys the idea of every thing arbitrary and cruel. And the New Testament abounds, more than the Old, with injunctions like this in the text, 'Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake.' These precepts are universal, and applicable to all times and places. To whatever land the Bible comes, to whatever conditions of men it reaches, and under whatever laws they live, it speaks but one language; '*Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man.*' A precept so important needs to be correctly understood, and its authority to be deeply felt. It is, therefore, proposed,

I. To explain the precept given. And

II. To consider the reason by which it is enforced.

I. The precept is to be explained. The phraseology is worthy of note. Submit yourselves. It does not say *obey.* Obedience may require the performance of some action; but *submission* may imply no more than subjection to the action of another. In many cases it is a precept to be passive in certain actions; in other cases, it may be our duty only to submit to the actions which others perform upon us. This distinction is one of great importance; and yet, it is not sufficiently considered. To ascertain the meaning of the precept in the text, let it be remarked, then,

1. It does not require us to do anything which God has elsewhere forbidden. The directions of the Bible are not self-contradictory. If they ever have that appearance to us, it must be for the want of sufficient attention on our part. Rightly understood, they are all perfectly harmonious. The divine law says, 'Thou shalt not steal.' If a human law should be passed, requiring us to steal, would it become our duty to steal? Would the precept in the text make it our duty to steal? The divine law says, 'Thou shalt not kill.' If a human law should be passed, prescribing those who had committed no crime, and directing them to be put to death, would that make it our duty to kill them? Where God has required the male children of the Hebrews to be put to death, that they might not increase faster than he deemed for his interest, did it become the duty of those to whom he gave the command, to put them to death? Or, did it rather approve of their disregard of Pharaoh's command, and reward them for their disobedience to it? The divine law forbids the setting up of other gods, and the worship of images. Nebuchadnezzar's decree required all his subjects to worship the image which he had set up. Was it, therefore, the duty of all his subjects to fall down and worship that image? Did the three Hebrews do wrong in refusing to comply with that law? Was not a miracle performed to protect them in their disobedience to it? In the early ages of christianity the Roman Emperors made laws which required all their subjects to worship in the heathen temples and burn incense to the false gods. Was it the duty of the Christians to comply with these laws, and deny the religion of the gospel? Did the multitudes of the martyrs suffer just as they should, because they refused to comply with those laws? In latter times, Roman Catholic sovereigns have made laws requiring their subjects to comply with the idolatrous services of the Roman Catholic Church. Was it therefore their duty to comply? And when thousands and thousands, for conscience' sake, suffered the spoiling of their goods, the loss of their liberty, and even death and death, because they did not obey those laws, are they to be regarded as doing wrong, and as justly condemned? There can be but one answer to all these questions. It is right to obey the law of God. And if human laws require us to do what God has forbidden, we must not obey them. And the precept in the text does not require us to obey them.

2. The precept in the text does not require us to neglect to do any thing which God has elsewhere required. When God commands it the duty of men to do any thing, human laws cannot absolve them from that duty. The divine law requires me to do unto others as I would have others do unto me. Can a human law absolve me from this duty, and lay me under obligation to do to others as I would not have others do to me? The law of Christ requires his disciples to confess him before men. If a human law should forbid this, would it absolve them from their obligation to obey the law of Christ? Daniel considered himself as required by the divine law to worship God, in his house, though a human law, procured for the very purpose, forbid any petition to be offered to God or man, for thirty days. Was it so? Was Daniel right in this matter? Or did this human law render it his duty to neglect what God required? A divine law required the apostles to preach Christ in Jerusalem, though a human law forbid them to do so. When arraigned before the council, 'The High Priest asked them, saying, Did not we strictly command you, that ye should not teach in this name? And, behold, ye have filled Jerusalem with your doctrine.' Did the apostles done right, or not? 'Then Peter and the other apostles answered, and said, we ought to obey God rather than men.' At the era of the Reformation, when the Protestants sought to spread the gospel in Roman Catholic countries, and human laws were passed to prevent their doing it, was it their duty to forbear? When the Puritans were forbidden to meet for the worship of God, and their preachers were forbidden to preach and administer the ordinances of the gospel, was it their duty to abstain? Did human laws absolve them from their obligation to obey the laws of Christ? At the present day, when the laws of China forbid the introduction of Christianity into that empire, is it the duty of the intrepid Gutzlaff to cease from his labors? Are the Christians of this country doing wrong to send him bibles, and tracts, and companions, to help on his work? Were laws to be passed in this land, to forbid our meeting for the worship of God, laws to forbid our reading the Bible in our families, and teaching our children to read, laws to forbid the circulation of religious tracts, and the instruction of our neighbors in the way of salvation through Christ, would it be our duty to obey those laws? Can the precept in the text rightly receive such a construction? Can human laws abrogate the laws of God? Can they render it sinful to do that which God has required? Can they render it our duty to disobey the commands of Christ? Certainly, the precept in the text cannot rightly receive any such construction.

If, then, the precept in the text does not require us to do any thing which God has forbidden, nor to neglect to do any thing which he has required, what is its meaning? Why are we commanded to submit ourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake? And what is implied in so doing? It may now be observed,

3. That the precept requires us *to obey human laws in all things that are lawful by the laws of God.* Somethings are right or wrong in their own nature; and no laws, human or divine, can ever alter their nature. Justice, kindness, and mercy, are right in their own nature; and no laws can ever constrain them to wrong. Selfishness, cruelty, and revenge, are wrong in their own nature; and no laws can ever render them right. Some things, in their own nature, are matters of indifference; and if there is no law on the subject, they may be done or left undone, according to our own pleasure. But if a law is made, by those in authority over us, which requires any of these things to be done, then it becomes our duty to do them. If a human law is made which requires of me the rendering of any personal service, or the performance of any personal labor, and the service or labor required is lawful in itself, and interferes with the performance of no other duty, then it is my duty to yield obedience to that law. And even if the law is hard, and the service required is unreasonable, yet if it can be rendered without interfering with any other duty, it is approved by the precept in the text binds me to the performance of that labor or service. Laws requiring the payment of taxes, may be very hard, and very unreasonable, and the exactions may be unjust and oppressive in the highest degree, yet, if I can pay what is demanded without interfering with the performance of any other duty, it may be my duty to comply. It was a question among the Jews, in our Saviour's time, whether it was lawful to pay tribute to Cesar or not. But he said, 'Render to Cesar the things that are Cesar's, and to God the things that are God's.' The apostles, in their epistles, require the payment of tribute to the authorities, without any question whether the exaction were reasonable or unreasonable. When the exactions of the government are deemed unreasonable and severe, there is a great temptation to evade the payment of the tribute, if it can be done. But I do not see how a good conscience can be maintained, and how the precept in the text can be complied with, consistently with the practice of any such evasion. If I may lawfully pay what is required by these in authority over me, I am bound in conscience to do so, *for the Lord's sake.* If I may, without sin, perform the labor or service required of me, then I must perform it, in compliance with the precept in the text. It is also to be observed,

4. That, where human laws inflict a punishment upon us for doing right, or for refusing to do wrong, we must submit to that punishment without resistance. Perhaps, I must think that the language of the text has a particular reference to cases of this kind. Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake. The ordinance of man may have required me to do what God has forbidden, and threatened a penalty for refusing. It was so in the case of the three Hebrews. The law of Nebuchadnezzar required them to fall down and worship the image which he had set up, under the penalty of being cast into the fiery furnace. It would have been a sin for them to worship the golden image; but they might submit with meekness to the infliction of the penalty. They did submit, and were sustained under it by a miracle. So also, the ordinance of man may have forbidden me to do what God has required, and threatened a penalty; as Daniel was forbidden to pray, for thirty days, under penalty of being cast into the den of lions. It would have been sin, to neglect to pray to God for thirty days. It was therefore the duty of Daniel to refuse a compliance with the sinful precept, and submit with meekness to the infliction of the penalty; and God sustained him under it. The duty of submitting to the penalty of an unjust law, does not require us to forbid any proper effort to escape it. We may defend ourselves by appeals before the tribunals, as Peter and John before the council, and Paul before Festus and Agrippa; or we may appeal from one tribunal to another, if the law allows us to do so, as Paul from Festus to Cesar. I think I not defend himself by force against violence; for I can find no example or precept of Christ or his apostles for so doing. And I understand the precept in the text forbid it. But I think we may lawfully flee from the suffering of an unjust law. And for this, we have both precept and example. Christ said, if they persecute you in one city, flee unto another. And Paul let down in a basket by a wall, to escape punishment at Damascus for preaching the gospel of Christ. I think the early Christians were sometimes in fault in not flying to throw themselves in the way of suffering, and refusing to escape when they might have done it. I believe it was, on the one hand, to court persecution, and, on the other, to neglect duty for fear of persecution. Let us commit no sin, do no wrong. Let human laws be obeyed, as far as what they require can be done without disobedience to God. And where they require any thing wrong, let us submit with temperate, but decided; mild, but firm; and the penalty be submitted to, in the spirit of meekness, after the example of our Lord Jesus Christ.

(To be continued.)

ANTI-SLAVERY PUBLICATIONS.

THE NEW-ENGLAND ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY have for sale at their office, No. 46, Washington-street,—

Rev. A. A. Phelps's Lectures on Slavery and its Remedy.

Letters of H. B. Stanton and Rev. Dr. H. Cox, with Speech of J. A. Thome of Kentucky.

Rev. C. P. Grosvenor's Address before the Anti-Slavery Society of Salem and Vicinity.

Child's Speech, the Despotism of Freedom.

Mrs. Child's Appeal in favor of the Africans of Americans called Africans.

Second Annual Report of the N. E. Anti-Slavery Society.

First Annual Report of the American Anti-Slavery Society.

Memoir and Poems of Phillis Wheatley.

Garrison's Thoughts on Colonization.

Ivimey's Lecture on Colonial Slavery.

Injustice and impolicy of the Slave Trade and of the Slavery of the African—by Hon. Jonathan Edwards, D.D.

Complete setts of the Abolitionist, vol. 1 & 2.

Do. bound with the 1st and 2d Annual Reports of the N. E. A. S. Society, Garrison's Address before the African Abolition Freehold Society of Boston, and a lecture before the Free People of Color in Boston, New-York, and Philadelphia.

Examination of Thomas C. Brown, at the Chatham Street Chapel, New-York.—

British Opinions of the American Colonization Society.

Garrison's Address before the African Abolition Freehold Society of Boston.

Anti-Slavery Hymns.

Analysis of the Report of a Committee of the House of Commons, on the extinction of Slavery, with notes by the Editor. London, pp. 213, price 75 cts.

Rankin's Letters on Slavery.

CUTTING THE PRESS.

'The Maryland Scheme Examined—by a Friend of Liberty.'

All orders promptly attended to by

B. C. BACON, *Agent.*

Boston, August 30, 1834.

ANTI-SLAVERY BOOK STORE,
67, *Leopenard-street, near Brattle.*

THE Subscriber offers for sale, at the above Establishment, Anti-Slavery publications of every description, wholesale or retail. Also, School Books and Stationery, Prints, &c., cheap for cash. Letter and Job Printing, Book Binding and Picture Framing, will be neatly executed. All orders will be thankfully received, and punctually attended to.

N.B. All orders must be cashed, and all communications must be post paid.

D. RUGGLES.

New-York, May 26, 1834.

MRS. BROWN'S SEMINARY FOR YOUNG LADIES,
No. 15, Elizabeth Street, Philadelphia.

THE subscriber, grateful for the encouragement which she has received, returns her sincere thanks to her friends, and still hopes by attention to merit to deserve their patronage. She would inform her friends that the School will be reopened the first of September, for the reception of pupils. The branches taught are Orthography, Reading, Writing, Arithmetic, Geography, Mapping, History, Bookkeeping, Composition, Plain and Ornamental-work, Rug-work, Marking, Bead-work.

The price of tuition is from $1.50 to $2. Persons desirous of sending their children from a distance, are informed that few or little girls can be accommodated with board. Every attention will be paid to their comfort as well as to their comfort and health. The situation of the School is pleasant and healthy. The terms for board, schooling, washing, and bedding, will be $80 a year, the first quarter paid in advance.

Respectable references can be given. Any communication, post paid, will be attended to.

A. BROWN.

August 23.

ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE.

THE New-England Anti-Slavery Society have opened an Office at No. 46, Washington-street, Boston, over the Reading Room of Messrs. Baker & Alexander, for the transaction of the business, and the accommodation of the friends of the cause of slavery. All anti-slavery works now or hereafter published, can be obtained at the Office on the most favorable terms. Gentlemen interested in the cause, in town or country, are respectfully invited to call.

Communications respecting the objects of the Society may be addressed to the subscriber, at said office.

B. C. BACON, *Sec'ry and Agent.*

Boston, July 26, 1834.

RICHARD DOUGLASS,

RESPECTFULLY informs his friends and the public, that he has established himself at No. 2, Belknap-street, where he will be glad to receive orders for cleaning and removing grease spots or stains in clothes, which will be attended to with despatch and all favors gratefully received.

May 31.